

School of Theology at Claremont



1001 1408279

# IN ETHICS IN THE WORLD WAR

---

W. Douglas Mackenzie





The Library  
SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY  
AT CLAREMONT

WEST FOOTHILL AT COLLEGE AVENUE  
CLAREMONT, CALIFORNIA

50  
354



# CHRISTIAN ETHICS IN THE WORLD WAR



524  
M316

# CHRISTIAN ETHICS IN THE WORLD WAR

BY

W. DOUGLAS MACKENZIE

PRESIDENT OF HARTFORD SEMINARY FOUNDATION



ASSOCIATION PRESS

NEW YORK: 347 MADISON AVENUE

1918

COPYRIGHT, 1918, BY  
THE INTERNATIONAL COMMITTEE OF  
YOUNG MEN'S CHRISTIAN ASSOCIATIONS

**DEDICATED**  
**TO**  
**MY FORMER AND PRESENT PUPILS**  
**WHO HAVING HEARD**  
**THE CALL OF THEIR COUNTRY AND THE MASTER**  
**OF US ALL**  
**HAVE GIVEN THEMSELVES TO VARIED FORMS OF SERVICE**  
**IN**  
**THE WORLD WAR**

*Gift from J. D. Perry 11/15/57*

**School of Theology**  
**at Claremont**

*A10401*



## PREFACE

The aim of this book is described in the introductory chapter. The subject has been partially treated in many books, pamphlets, and articles since August, 1914. But there is good reason why it should be discussed as a whole, a chapter in Christian Ethics. For the department of Christian teaching which is known as Ethics always contains some pages devoted to the State and the Church, and also to the place of war in the life of man. These three topics are drawn together in these pages. Each of them has been the subject of whole volumes. I have had to cut a straight path through the forest, avoiding important aspects of each, and all technical matters; concentrating directly on the main problems which disturb the Christian conscience as it struggles to live in a darkened world.

As the substance of this book was given in the form of lectures to students in Christian Ethics, I have ventured to retain the occasional use of the first personal pronoun.

W. D. M.



# CONTENTS

	PAGE
Preface.....	vii

## CHAPTER I INTRODUCTORY

1. Correct statement of the ethical problem.....	3
2. Perplexity and Pacifism.....	5
3. The facts to be investigated.....	12

## CHAPTER II THE STATE AND THE CITIZEN

1. Definition of a State.....	17
2. The State a divine institution.....	20
3. The State and physical force.....	22
4. The State and the individual.....	26
5. The individual and the State.....	27
6. The influence of religion.....	28
7. International life and morality.....	30
8. Forms of the State.....	33
9. The vision of a universal State.....	34

## CHAPTER III THE STATE, THE INDIVIDUAL, AND WAR

1. Aggressive war and Christian morality.....	39
2. The moral obligation of an invaded nation....	41
3. Belgium as the supreme illustration.....	45
4. Sacrifice and force.....	47

# CONTENTS

## CHAPTER IV

### THE GERMAN MILITARIST DOCTRINE OF THE STATE

	PAGE
1. "The will to power".....	53
2. The good of the people.....	56
3. Efficiency and defects.....	58
4. The formation of German character.....	59
5. Relation of German nation to other nations...	61
6. The resulting doctrine of war.....	66
7. Criticism.....	69

## CHAPTER V

### THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH

1. The founding of the Church.....	75
2. Definition of the Church.....	77
3. The Church and the State.....	79
4. Christ and the State.....	80
5. The Sermon on the Mount.....	86
6. Can a State imitate the sacrifice of Christ?...	94
7. The teaching of the Apostle Paul.....	96
8. The ethics of the Church and of the State....	100
9. War and the doctrine of love.....	103
10. Can we pray for the Germans?.....	108
11. Summary of argument.....	112

## CHAPTER VI

### ETHICAL VALUES IN THE WORLD WAR

A. THE AIMS AND METHODS OF GERMANY	
1. Germany began the war.....	119
2. German policy.....	124
3. German preparation.....	125

## CONTENTS

xi

	PAGE
4. German methods of warfare.....	128
a. World-wide treachery	
b. War is between nations, therefore ruthless	
c. Evacuation of conquered territories	
5. German use of treaties.....	139
6. German practice based on theory.....	140
7. Is all Germany guilty?.....	141

### CHAPTER VII

#### ETHICAL VALUES IN THE WORLD WAR

B. THE AIMS AND SPIRIT OF THE ENTENTE AND THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA	
1. Correct and incorrect forms of stating the question.....	145
2. Moral value of the conduct of the Allies on entering the war.....	147
3. Policy of President Wilson.....	151
4. The declaration of war by the United States...	155
5. The duty of America.....	156

### CHAPTER VIII

#### ETHICAL GAINS IN THE WAR

1. From study of the moral standing of the belliger- ents.....	161
2. From the moralizing of war.....	164
3. From the defence of democracy.....	167
4. The moral standards of the soldiers.....	172
5. The birth of a universal State.....	174
6. Industrial and social reconstruction.....	177
7. Enthusiasm for personal service.....	180
8. The victory of the Sermon on the Mount....	185
INDEX.....	191



## INTRODUCTORY

“No natural instinct, nothing less than a moral obligation, can be an excuse for risking the lives of our citizens, for threatening the lives of other men.”

—*Frederick Denison Maurice.*

## CHAPTER I

### INTRODUCTORY

As no war has ever been so extensive as this one, it is no less true that never before have so many men and women inquired with agony of soul into the origin and meaning of war. The numbers and the agony are beyond our ken. So much has been already gained since August, 1914. For we may perhaps dare to assume that when a sufficient number of human beings have pursued the inquiry deep enough, with grief and moral indignation, wars will cease.

1. We must make clear to ourselves the correct form in which we are to put the question. At the outset we shall refuse to consider it in this form, "Is war right or wrong?" Later in the discussion we shall have to cite the opinion of those who say that war is necessary for the best development of human nature, and that it is the highest duty of every nation that would be strong and great to be ever perfecting itself in the art of war. Here we must point out that the question is infected with what we may call the disease of abstraction. Against that infection students of

Ethics must be continually warned. The word "war" is evidently used to cover a vast multitude of individual wars, and to include both sides in any one war. Those who answer, "War is right," are reasoning, as logicians would say, from the particular to the universal. Because some wars in some ages, and under some circumstances, have produced good results, therefore war is right. That is not convincing. The other party, who answer, "War is wrong," begin with the universal proposition that all war springs from passion and sin, and always involves the killing of men, and conclude that no nation has any right under any circumstances to engage in war. It is the purpose of these pages to prove that both methods of argument are logically fallacious and the conclusion in both cases is false.

Nor can we be satisfied with the exact form into which Sir Gilbert Murray has thrown the question: "How can war ever be right?"<sup>1</sup> For it is clear that in any case with which we can be practically concerned, war must be always wrong on at least one side. Both sides may indeed be guilty, equally guilty, of the immeasurable crime, but there may be cases where one side is free from blame in the eyes of posterity and of God. If one side made the contest inevitable by unjust demands, if it refused the last, desperate offer of reconciliation without

---

<sup>1</sup> "Faith, War, and Policy." By Sir Gilbert Murray.

bloodshed, issued the aggressive ultimatum, fired the first shot, that one is guilty; and for it that war, whatever its issue may be, can never "be right." But what of the other side? Can that war be a right war for it? That is the real question with which we are practically concerned. For there are those who maintain that there are no conceivable circumstances under which a nation has the right to engage in war. The government of a people ought indeed to maintain just and honorable relations with all others, and if its rights are invaded, it ought to protest, it ought to use all the powers of moral suasion which can be discovered, but it ought never to fight. The real question which confronts the modern man, therefore, when it is expressed carefully and clearly, is this: "Are there any circumstances in which it is the moral and religious duty of a government to engage in war?" That puts the matter in its final form, as a problem in Christian Ethics, and that is the question which it is proposed to discuss in the following pages as frankly and yet as briefly as possible.

2. There are three classes of people for whom the discussion is mainly intended. First, there is that very large class who look upon war, especially this war in all its monstrous extent and horror, with spiritual dismay. They feel rather than see that the purely pacifist attitude contains some

error, but they cannot name it. They are confused by the contrast between the vast fields of carnage and destruction, and the spirit of peace and love which they identify rightly with the name of Christ. And yet they cannot bring themselves to believe and to say with the courage born of reasoned conviction that America was wrong to enter the fray. They feel that she was right, and yet feel also as if it were a sin to say so, a sin against that spirit of peace and love.

In the next place there are those soldiers, born and bred to lives of industry and honor, whose very breath was to live and let live, rather to help all others to live nobly and righteously and happily. Now they are suddenly caught into a career where they are to share in the dreadful work of killing their fellowmen. Many of these noble young men have been driven almost to madness on the field of battle by the crushing hideous facts before them, the heaps of slain, the stream of wounded carried in all degrees of shatteredness and pain, to suffer on beds of torture, perhaps to go through the long years of a life that promised sunshine and freedom and health, maimed, or halt, or blind—or mad. How can this be the will of God? That is the bitter cry of many a brave and confident soldier as he returns to billets, with a heart bruised and sick, wounded more deeply than he of the shattered frame.

In the third place there are those who occupy the position of reasoned pacifism. Several Christian sects have arisen which hold that it is wrong to make war, in the sense that it can never be right in any conceivable circumstances for a government to come to its citizens and order them to fight against an enemy. The Society of Friends, popularly known as the Quakers, is the leading exponent of this view. The movement began in England in the seventeenth century, though it had been variously prepared for in the course of the sixteenth century. It has had a most honorable history. Its members have been distinguished alike for piety and a noble philanthropy. William Penn, the founder of Pennsylvania, John Howard, the prison reformer, Wilberforce, the triumphant worker for the liberation of slaves throughout the British Empire, are among its many illustrious names. The Government of the United States has done honor to the history and influence of the Quakers by exempting from direct military service members of that Society who adhere to its traditional interpretation of the meaning of war and of their relation to it as followers of Christ.

What is that interpretation? It can be better understood if we remember that it was preached with great success at a period when war was accepted almost as a normal condition of national life. All nations in Europe had their ambitions

for self-aggrandizement, their hereditary monarchies, whose dynastic interests were matters of national concern and defence, and consequently their professional soldiers, ready and eager always for the fray. Many earnest men and women saw and felt that this was wrong. They contrasted the situation with the spirit of the New Testament, and asked how professedly Christian nations could maintain the habit of warfare, in this deliberate manner. Further, these devoted souls endeavored to apply literally the specific words of Jesus Christ to their daily conduct. They refused to take oaths in court because He said, "Swear not at all." They refused to give each other titles, even to address anyone as "Mister," because Jesus said, "Call no man Master." In the same spirit they understood the command which Jesus quoted from the Old Testament and deepened, "Thou shalt not kill." They so understood the words, "Resist not evil," and asserted that no one could obey the great and glorious law, "Love your enemies," and engage in any war for any cause.

These men were not cowards. It is foolish to say that all pacifists are "yellow," have no red blood in their veins, and are taking refuge in a religious plea to shelter a craven spirit under sacred words. Many of these Quakers of the seventeenth century were very brave, heroically enduring all manner of persecution and physical suffering rather than

do what they believed to be wrong. And many of their representatives today are as noble of spirit as they.

In recent times the pacifist position has been maintained by arguments which are drawn not from Scripture, but from a certain philosophy of human nature. Man is not primarily prone to evil, but to good, it is said. He will not resist the appeal to the generosity, the humanity, that is latent in him. If you trust a man, he will respond to your trust. If you refuse to resist his physical attack, he will be ashamed and withhold the hand that was raised to strike. *In the long run*, it is urged, though not in every individual case, the refusal to fight will result in the greater good. It is an extension of this argument when philosophical anarchists hold that the root of all social disorder is to be found in the use of physical force by the governments of the world. The use of force, it is said, calls out and encourages the evil in man. Remove that incubus from the history of society, and the inherent goodness of human nature will spring to light. Men will be honest if you do not force them to it. Men will be pitiful if all men desist from revenge or physical retaliation.

This line of thought has gradually allied itself with the religious position described above, in a very interesting and subtle way. Assuming that human history is under the guidance of God and

that in all men there is a spark of the divine, the true attitude of every reverent soul is to leave the governance of the race to the persuasive, all-pervasive Spirit of God. He who resists evil takes the scepter out of the hands of God. He smites his fellowman for a wrong done, while punishment ought to be left with Him who alone dispenses justice with unerring wisdom and absolute sympathy. Moreover, the supreme rule of God over man is through the appeal of perfect love. It is not the divine terror but the divine mercy that is the source of salvation and hope. Rather than resist evil with physical force Jesus died on the cross, and from that sublime act of self-devotion the fountain of life has sprung for all the race of men. He had faith in the power of sacrificial love to win the victory, and history is slowly but surely justifying His confidence.

From these facts, and facts they are, the conclusion is drawn that all men who follow Christ ought to make the same appeal to human nature. *In the long run* it will respond. Love will prove itself omnipotent. The most selfish and most cruel fiends will at last give way before the irresistible appeal of innocence that remains meek, and loving-kindness that refuses all resistance or revenge. If any one nation would wholly disarm and pursue no policy but that of purest honor, no other nation would dare to attack it. Its courageous helplessness

would disarm its foes. But since no government has yet been found Christian enough to accept this as its law of life and rather die as a government than fight an assaulting foe, there is nothing left for individual followers of Christ, and the communities which they compose, but to refuse obedience to any government which would enlist them in even a defensive war against the most indefensible and wicked assault by another people.

The argument of reasoned pacifism might be elaborated, but these are its fundamental positions, and I have tried to put them as fairly and sympathetically as I can. I hope it may not be too personal a matter, but may help the reader himself, if I say that I who write at one time occupied this position. In boyhood I was brought directly and indirectly under powerful and gracious Quaker influence. In young manhood I gave much thought to the problem of Peace and War, and was proud to have some of my public statements reproduced, with compliments that a young man welcomes, in *The Herald of Peace*, of London, England. As I look back I can remember that, strange to say, the first stirrings of doubt arose when I was reading Tolstoi. His sheer individualism in religion, his arbitrary and wayward dealing with the New Testament and even with the teaching of Him whom he accepted as his supreme Authority and Master, led me at last through other lines of thought

to see that the argument outlined above, persuasive and pious as it is, rests upon foundations that are too narrow to carry the weight of the world's life. Gradually it became clear that the following fundamental matters must be reconsidered.

3. First, war must be considered as a function of national government. The ordinary puzzle put to pacifists, "What would you do if a man assaulted you?" is irrelevant. Even the further question, "What would you do to a man who tried to murder your wife?" does not present an exact parallel, but only a partial illustration of what is meant by war. War is a national act; and its moral significance can be studied only by investigating what we mean by the State, what its nature and functions are, and what those duties are which rest upon the individual as the citizen of a definite country, ruled by a definite government.

Second, the Christian man is not by his conversion separated at once from all secular relations and obligations. He remains a member of a family, perhaps a family of unbelievers. He remains the citizen of a country, where he lives and whose government both protects him and exacts from him certain duties, even although it be not a professedly Christian government.

Third, the Christian man is a member of the specific organization or community called the Church. From the beginning, from the hour when

Jesus deliberately founded and taught and ruled this community in His own lifetime on earth, on, through its fuller establishment after His death and resurrection, into its rich and multiform history in the world, it has found itself related to the State in many intricate ways. The one institution has acted upon the other continuously. At times they have seemed to be rivals. One has sought to subdue and absorb the other. At the best they have been but imperfect coadjutors in the great task of perfecting the conditions and the character of human history. Today, in most countries of the world, they are recognized as separate, complementary institutions, each having its own sphere of influence, its characteristic work to do.

The problem of war which we are discussing in these pages can only be solved, if solved at all, by means of a careful consideration of these two supreme institutions in human life. What is the meaning (or *telos*) of each? How does each stand related to the will of God? How does the spirit of the one affect the spirit of the other? What does each do for the individual, and what shall the individual do for each? These are some of the questions which we must investigate if we are to have any chance of answering the main inquiry which we have set before us.



# THE STATE AND THE CITIZEN



## CHAPTER II

### THE STATE AND THE CITIZEN

1. When we speak or sing of "my country," we are thinking primarily of the territory or region where we and the nation to which we belong are established. It is our "fatherland." Its "templed hills" and valleys are in our mind, and all peoples speak with thrilling love of the scenes where their fathers died and their own life is spent. When we speak of the "nation," it is the inhabitants whom we have in view. We picture all the classes which compose it, from the highest to the lowest, the rulers and the ruled, the rich and the poor, the dweller in the city and the laborer on the farm, the men and women, parents and children, home and friendly circle. They compose the nation. When we speak of the "government," our eye is upon those on whom authority rests for the ordering of the life of the nation, the protection of the land from invasion. When we speak of the "State," we summarize all these in a conception which includes them all. The State is the name we give to a mass of human beings occupying a definite territory, among whom there is an ordered life

resting on a certain form of government, and who stand in recognized relations with other similar masses of human beings, occupying their own territory and exercising sovereignty over their own life. When each State is looked at in relation to the one life of its whole people and in relation to the life of other States, it takes the form of an idealized individual. It is looked upon as having a character of its own, interests of its own, a will of its own. Hence there has grown up in the process of time even a system of law known as "international law," which seeks to determine the moral conditions under which States may act toward one another. This system seeks to guide and restrain the conduct of nations as if they were individuals capable of distinguishing between right and wrong, responsible for their actions towards one another, liable to reproof and correction for wrongdoing.

The State has existed from the beginnings of human history, and has assumed innumerable forms. Its changes can be traced through the patriarchal to the tribal form. The growth of the independent and rival Greek cities led to the identification of the State with the individual city, in which all the freemen had an equal voice in the making of laws, bearing the burden and directing the external policy of the community. The rise in modern times of nations, which comprised cities

and rural populations, created the more extended forms of monarchical and republican government. The combination of republican and monarchical ideals gave rise to what are known as limited or constitutional monarchies. The sway of one ruler or one centralized government over peoples who had enjoyed an independent national life gave rise to the fact, and the theory, of the Empire. All these classes of state organization have existed in forms too numerous to be named or described in these pages.

That which stands out as an indubitable fact is that some kind of State, some measure and form of centralized government, is essential to the well-being and the moral development of mankind. Even if men were sinless, agreements would have to be reached, arrangements formally made and publicly announced, operations would have to be directed, from a central authority for the organization of the activities of men in their united concerns. The alternative to state government is not freedom, but chaos.

When we remember that man is inherently self-seeking, that this gives rise as a well-observed fact to universal selfishness, with all its results in vice, cruelty, deceit, greed, and their miserable consequences, we see that a central authority, which means a recognized tribunal of justice, the execution of penalties upon wrong-doing, is

absolutely essential. Only so can order of the most primitive character be established and those conditions secured in which the moral progress as well as the physical well-being of man can be made possible. Hegel, in an interesting passage, has used the illustration of a house. As wind and fire and water are used to build the house, whose object is to defend the dwellers in it against these natural forces, so the State is erected out of the passions and desires of the individual to defend the nation against them. Undisciplined, they are destructive of the nation; coordinated and controlled by law and force, they contribute to its richer life.<sup>1</sup>

"The principle of the State is the idea of Right. This does not mean that the State is the sole administrator of justice on earth; justice has also a place in the family and its discipline, in the Church, and in the life of the individual. But it administers public right, and has to express it by means of compulsion and with the certainty of a national force."<sup>2</sup>

2. From the very beginnings of history the existence and authority of the State have been connected with the religious faith and life of every people. All kingly prerogatives have been traced to the will of the god whom the tribe or the nation

---

<sup>1</sup> Hegel, "Philosophy of History." Trans. by Sibree, pp. 28, 29.

<sup>2</sup> Dorner, "Christian Ethics." Trans., p. 558.

worshiped. It is natural that in the course of thought upon the subject it should become clear that much superstition was mixed up with this idea. Low ideas and primitive ideas of man and of his relations to the Creator and Lord of his life must color his conception of the State and its function. But this does not lead inevitably to the conclusion that the will of God has no relation to the existence and work of the State. It is true, we cannot hold that the chief of his tribe is in direct communication with the divine, from whom he receives immediate revelations of his duty and of the coming fortunes of his people. Nor can we fail to see defects in the view held by ancient Israel concerning the nature of the theocracy under which the noble leaders and inspired prophets of that race strove to guide the destinies and mould the character of that people. The view that God Himself announced in a supernatural way all the explicit and detailed laws of a nation cannot be maintained. But this by no means implies that the State exists outside the will of God, nor that the will of God has no relation to the development of its political and legal system.<sup>3</sup>

It must be insisted that any principle of con-

---

<sup>3</sup> The State as a Divine Institution: "The State is neither a divine creation of God nor something that is wholly secular; but it is a human product resting on a divine basis, and thus has both a divine and a human side." Dorner, "Christian Ethics." Trans., p. 555.

duct which springs from the nature of man and of that world in which he lives is essentially divine. It is an ordinance of God. The working out of that principle is indeed largely in the power of man. It is the very law of his nature that he can do what he ought to do and become what he ought to be only by discovering the needs of action and the ideals of character, by the exercise of his mind, by response to his inherent instincts and impulses and appetites. But it is also a law of his nature that the discovery of his ideals, the control and right use of his instincts and appetites, the development of his character, have never been possible without some vision of the divine law and the consciousness of relation to the divine will.

3. The State exists as the organization of a people, for the promotion of their entire well-being. Its form may change, but the end must always be the same. When this aim is lost sight of and the well-being of a dynasty or a regnant class is promoted at the cost of the community as a whole, the rulers will in course of time be overthrown and either new men take their place, and do better or worse, or the very form of government may be changed in hope of a worthier result for the mass of the people. Tyranny exercised by an autocracy, or corrupt government conducted by a representative legislature and executive, always interfere with that "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness" which

are the fundamental rights of the people as a whole. The extent of that interference, when we take account also of the intelligence and virility of the nation, determines the hour of a revolution. At some point the intolerable limit is reached, and the seats of the mighty are cast down. History abundantly proves that such changes, whether violent or gradual and orderly, arise from the judgment of the people, from the working of their deep, instinctive demand for justice, freedom, and peace, that they may enjoy the fruits of their labor and secure the ideals of happiness which they cherish.

The State, then, must exist for the good of the individual and the mass of individuals which compose it. These must be protected against one another and against their enemies from without. Laws are made and executed, not to destroy, but to establish the freedom and selfhood of the citizen. Right laws are not restrictive, except upon selfishness and criminal intent. They are intended either to forbid wrongdoing or to lay down the rules, mark out the relations, which will enable all the citizens most fully to develop their individual powers and attain their lawful ambitions.

Now the fact that men are selfish and so many are vicious makes it necessary for the State to use physical force to secure the ends for which it exists. In an immoral world it is the moral duty of the State to use force. It is basic to all other

functions of government, is named in every law where penalties are defined, is visible to the public in every policeman, and in fact pervades the entire civilized order in which we live. Without it there would be chaos.<sup>4</sup>

The people who revolt against the use of force and wish to establish a social arrangement without it, yet live by it even in the making of their plea. The anarchist who would destroy physical-force-government by dynamite, carries his dynamite in a taxicab under police laws which save his life in the doing of it. For it is the policeman at the street corner who prevents a collision of his taxicab that would blow the anarchist to pieces. "My right to walk along the high road involves an obligation upon all other persons not to obstruct me, and in the last resort the State will send horse, foot, and artillery rather than let me be causelessly obstructed in walking along the high road."<sup>5</sup>

It is true that we are learning to use more than force, whether by fine or imprisonment, or by capital punishment. Our social workers and religious prison reformers are rightly insisting that more can be done for society than merely inflicting physical punishment on lawbreakers. But it is clear that when the utmost is done for prisoners,

---

<sup>4</sup> See Bluntschli's admirable brief chapter on "The Theory of Force," in "The Theory of the State," pp. 242, 243.

<sup>5</sup> B. Bosanquet, "The Philosophical Theory of the State," p. 209.

they are yet prisoners; and it is only on the basis of their liability to punishment that moral influences can be brought to bear upon them successfully. Again it is true that "the place of actual fear of punishment in maintaining the social system is really very small, while the place of a habituation, which is essentially ethical, is comparatively large."<sup>6</sup> But this habituation to the laws and customs of the State and of society is made possible by the physical force which underlies the entire social order. A man lives freely and healthily when he has formed and obeyed such rules of living as produce health and freedom, and he may even "forget that he has a stomach." But dyspeptic penalties are part of the system of life, elements in the physical basis on which his conduct rests, and the penalties will be inflicted if he breaks his good habits. So it is with the mass of citizens. They obey the law as a rule without thought of penalties. In fact there are only three occasions in a well-ordered community when the physical force of the State is directly considered, namely, when a law with penalties is promulgated, when a criminal is punished, when a citizen or a group are tempted by greed or passion or ambition deliberately to transgress a known law. But even for a law-abiding community, law and penalty are

---

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 290, 291.

ever-present as the, as it were, "subconscious" bases of life.

4. Of course history has revealed the fact that there are intricate and baffling problems involved in the relation of the State to the individual citizen. What are the limits of the State's responsibility? How far can it rightly and healthily go in the restraint of individual impulse? This is a perplexing question, and is under constant discussion, alike among students of political science, legislators, and thoughtful citizens. Theoretically the State claims the whole life of the individual for the good of the community. But the State, being human, has not perfect knowledge, and therefore has not perfect authority. Moreover, there are sacred depths in the life of a personal being into which no fellowman can enter, and there are individual rights which no one can surrender without the loss of manhood itself. The fight for freedom of thought in religious matters is one example, the most influential of all, of the fact that there are regions of personal life with which the State cannot safely deal. We recognize that if the very liberty and happiness, for whose preservation the State exists, are to be cherished, a limit to its control of the individual must be established. Beyond that point, the State would create slavery if it interfered with the natural action of the individual personality.

This fact has been recognized by the action of the United States Government in granting exemption from active military service to those who at the time of the declaration of war in April, 1917, were members of certain religious communities, which have been for centuries committed to the pacifist position. In a way the Government could take no other attitude. For these communities came from Europe because they were persecuted for holding pacifist and other unpopular doctrines. The fact that they have been accepted and classed among the citizenry of this country gives them that claim to special treatment which has been acknowledged and honored. But even there the Government has drawn a line. It reserves the right to conscript pacifist citizens for those forms of service in connection with the war which serve to heal the wounds it has made and to restore what it has destroyed. In all this the State is striving both to honor that in the individual life which ought to lie beyond its province, and yet to insist on the full measure of that personal service which every citizen owes to the whole nation.

5. What are the responsibilities of the individual towards the State? Under the latter he has received his birth, education, health, and all the conditions for the making and enjoying of his livelihood. Under its protection he has established his family and pursues the higher aims of culture

and religion. In return he owes, first, obedience to the laws and regulations of the community from which he derives his earthly life and its conditions. Further, he owes to the State his own cordial support and assistance in the performance of its vital functions. To the modern world it has become clear that no State can prosper whose individual members do not cherish a sincere loyalty and render constant and intelligent assistance. The more intelligent the citizens become, the more wide is their interest in all the concerns of the nation to which they belong. The more they value what they have received from it, the more they are determined to render what service they can in preserving and conveying to succeeding generations the institutions from which such blessings have flowed to themselves. But the individual has something no less essential than obedience and support to contribute. If he be a man of high moral ideals, and still more if he be of high religious aspiration, he is able to contribute to the national life something which is absolutely essential to its continuous development and power. He can bring all sides of the national life, all the functions of government, all the details of legislation and administration, into comparison with those ideals of human relationship which only religion fully discloses to our view.

6. There are many factors which contribute to

the evolution of a national character and of national fortunes, and many efforts have been made to identify and describe these factors and to appraise their relative values. In recent times there has been a tendency to undervalue the influence of religion. But thoughtful men have always seen that from the beginning of history national ideals have been closely associated with religious faith. No doubt the material and outward side of a nation's history acts on its religion, and that in more ways than the churches usually realize. But the highest religion has an independent life of its own, is a distinct fountain of energy in human nature, originates history as well as receives influence from history. Hence no nation can live well and move toward the best forms of national character and international influence whose religion has lost grip upon the conscience and intelligence of its people. It is those who worship God most sincerely, who know best His will, those who possess in fullest measure and are most completely surrendered to the divine spirit, who do most to sustain the nobler side of the national life. It is from them that the severest rebukes, in them that the intensest hatred, of crime and vice and all materialistic habits arise. They are, of course, objects of derision and hatred on the part of those who live in these things which they condemn; but, in spite of their defects—the unwisdom of their methods, the partial nature of

their own visions, and the imperfections of their character—they are always the springs of the loftiest patriotism, the real directors and sustainers of the noblest will of the State.

In the nation whose citizens consciously receive the blessings of orderly government, and render to the State the truest service, there arises that spirit of patriotism which in dignity, in fulness of meaning, and in range of power is second only to the claims of the religious life. No doubt patriotism, like all other human affections or operations, has its dangers; but he knows nothing of the deep life of man nor of the history of nations who does not see that in patriotism there is a force at work which has contributed some of the richest elements to the moral and spiritual elevation of the human race. It is in the name of patriotism that men give themselves to the service of their country, unselfishly, willingly; it is in the name of patriotism that they are willing to die that the nation may live.

7. It has been a defect in many students of political science that they have considered the State too much as if it grew in isolation, functioned in isolation as to the interests of its own people, then suddenly found itself confronted with other States. No wonder it has seemed to such students as if the primary relation of one State to another, thus conceived as exclusive of each other in origin, organization, and growth, must be one of friction.

People seem to think that nations must have grown up saying of each other only this, "We are natural enemies because we are different States." There are signs already that the World War will compel many scholars to revise their whole manner of thinking at this point. As a matter of fact, modern nations are born, and grow, and die in a community of nations. Even the United States sprang from another nation, and grew in the colonial period to a measure of power and self-consciousness in relation with the aborigines of this country and the nations of Europe from which the colonists had come. For nearly a hundred years some statesmen have tried, always in vain, to maintain the life of the United States in isolation from the lives of other countries. But the efforts of the Government in this direction have been continuously counteracted by the whole life of the people. Immigration and travel, commerce and culture, religion and art, have all combined their forces to keep America in the family of nations and to develop her life in continuous contact with the life of foreign peoples.

As there is no such thing as a mere individual man, so there is no such thing as a mere individual State. Hence there always has been a wide range of conduct in which nations have dealt with one another, and a less wide range of conduct in which their governments have formally acted in relation to each other. These relations are much more

than those which can be covered by such words as "alliance" and "war." Treaties have been formed and honorably observed, whose breach could never have led to war. The observance of such treaties has rested upon the fact that there are moral relations which bind States together as individuals are bound together, and that a sense of honor can be kindled in the heart of one nation in its dealings with another. The laws of honesty and even of generosity obtain in the international field, as in the field of private business and individual life. Instinctively all people have realized that the State as an expression of the moral unity of a nation must act in the name of the character of that nation. If the nation is composed of men of honor, the State will act with honor. If the nation is composed of people who seek to convey blessings of education and religion to each other, the State will be impelled to think of other nations in terms of a like benevolence. The nation that has created foreign missions will gradually inspire its government with the will to lift up dependent races, over whom it has in the course of history obtained control. America reflects the religious spirit and morality of her people by her dealings with the people of the Philippine Islands. It was a great missionary who first moved the Government of India to establish a system of education for the people of that land. And it was the develop-

ment of the love of constitutional government and of individual freedom in Great Britain which made that people the leaders of the world in the sublime task of lifting up primitive races by the very methods of their government and the spirit of their national dealings with them.

There is, then, a morality of nations, of which the prescriptions of international law are but imperfect expressions, just as the statute laws of any people are but a partial reflection of the total moral consciousness and behavior of the individuals who compose it.

8. Reference already has been made to the divergent forms which the State has assumed at different periods of history, and in different parts of the world at any one period. Today the varieties of state organization have made it exceedingly difficult to say exactly what the limitations of nationality actually are. The national consciousness itself assumes various forms and is realized in varying degrees of intensity, according to the range of relationship in which each community stands towards the rest of the world. Thus before 1871 each portion of the German Empire existed as a separate State, and yet people spoke of the German nation, though there was no State embracing all the German peoples. Switzerland is a nation which comprises a number of self-governing cantons differing in race, language, and religion,

and in other characteristics. The British Empire deals with the world as one State, and yet comprises within itself an indefinite and perplexing variety of forms of government. Canada speaks of itself as a nation; Australia calls itself a commonwealth; India is known as an Empire; within the boundaries of South Africa a number of distinct forms of government still exist, in addition to that young State known as the Union of South Africa. The United States has become an Empire standing in peculiar and separate relations with Porto Rico, Cuba, and the Philippines, not to speak of the Panama Canal Zone. The war has brought suddenly into view the right of every distinct people to maintain what is called their self-determination, and the Allies at present are pledged to secure full opportunity for even very small nations in Europe to realize their independent existence, to organize themselves into States according to their own genius and ideals.

9. It is manifest that in spite of this vast variety of conditions under which humankind is organized, the vision of Mankind itself is rising before the minds of all men. The world is being drawn together into a conscious unity of life. The races are realizing themselves as the Human Race, the peoples of the earth are almost rushing into the most astonishing revelation of what humanity can become. The nations and the States are preparing

themselves deliberately, with open eyes, for a new era, in which there shall be, first, an irresistible effort to honor the national consciousness of the smallest peoples, and in which the forces of the mightiest empires shall be brought under the control of a new international system. No one can at present describe the form which that system will assume. We may be sure that it will react upon the fundamental morality of humankind, that it will aim at an adequate and clear definition of international law, and that it will be content with nothing less than the establishing of some tribunal or other method of securing the observance of international law by all the States that exist in the world. None shall be so small as to be treated contrary to that law, none shall be so great that it can with impunity trample upon the prescriptions of that law. Towards this the world has been slowly moving since the discovery of America. The pace of movement was accelerated by Christian missions, commerce, and the bringing of all the world into relationship with Western civilization during the nineteenth century. The tides are now rushing with incalculable force, carrying all nations into a position where they must begin history afresh, together, in deliberate cooperation, on the basis of a divine, universal, absolutely authoritative moral law.



# THE STATE, THE INDIVIDUAL, AND WAR



### CHAPTER III

## THE STATE, THE INDIVIDUAL, AND WAR

This brings us to consider the function of the State in relation to the practice of war.

1. To begin with, it may be confidently asserted that no Christian man of the type with whom we may be concerned can or will defend an aggressive war. By that we mean a war undertaken by one State against another in order to deprive the latter of territory, commerce, or inhabitants for the exclusive benefit of the former. And in doing so it is good to claim the theoretical support of a man so Christian as Professor W. Herrmann of Marburg in his well-known work on Ethics; although, alas! he has forsaken the position in practice by his support of the German policy in this war. "War is for the Christian morally justified, if it is politically correct, as an act of self-assertion on the part of a people in the carrying out of its culture-task (*Kulturaufgabe*),"<sup>1</sup> that is, in maintaining and propagating its own type of culture. If Herrmann explicitly limits this statement to the act of self-defence on the part of a people desiring

---

<sup>1</sup> W. Herrmann, "Ethik." 2d Ed., p. 189.

to defend its own form of civilization against invasion by another people, there can be no objection to it, as we shall see later on. He goes on to urge that it is the duty of the Christian to establish the conviction among the peoples that war for any other reason destroys the people that walk into it.

It is, as we have already insisted, an essential view, absolutely necessary to be held, that the rules of Christian morality govern States as States. For, let it be repeated, the State is not a mere addition to the nature of the individual man, it is not a new kind of being in addition to the sum and organization of the individuals composing it. Rather is it the expression of the prevailing moral character and personal ideals of all its citizens. It is the effort of all these wills to act as one will. When we speak of it as if it were a person, we must remember always that it is less than a person, and yet is the attempt of all the persons who belong to it to interpret the meaning of life and to realize it in harmony with one another. Hence the rules of justice and of honor apply to the conduct of citizens through the State, in their unified will, as truly as through the family, and other groups within the State, to which each man belongs.

We have seen that there are limits to what the State may attempt to do with and for its citizens. These limits are fixed on the one hand by its own

limitations of wisdom, insight, and goodness, on the other by the sacred depths of the personal life of its citizens and the necessity for a large and indefinite measure of freedom, without which the individual person cannot fully live his own true life and be in fullest measure the person he is fitted to be. But when these complementary facts are understood, it becomes clear that the State must be made subject to the same fundamental principles of morality as the individual in its dealing with other States. Hence there can be no just reason invented for an aggressive war whose aim is the murder and robbery of one State by another State. The aggrandizement of one nation at the cost of the freedom and rights of another nation, or even the propagation of a higher form of civilization, by war, is immoral. Only an autocracy could deny this and menial philosophers support the denial; only an ignoble democracy can make it the deliberate policy of its government.

2. The essential question, then, for a student of Christian Ethics, and the one at present urgent question, is this: What is the duty of a State, which while maintaining good conduct on its own side is actually attacked and invaded for purposes of conquest and depredation by another State? The whole and fundamental fact is that when an invading army crosses its border it becomes an organized mass of murderers and robbers. They are col-

lectively and individually within the scope of its government. Towards them it has the same duties as towards all others who are living at that time upon its territory. The invaded State has the same responsibility, though a heavier task, towards the invading criminals as towards the less numerous, less organized, less equipped criminals among its own citizens. If the State is to fulfil its duty, the invading force must be put down. Whatever force is necessary to do this must be exercised at all costs, and to the limit of the powers of the nation which the State represents and for which it acts. Manifestly the invading criminals cannot be arrested and imprisoned by the ordinary police force. Their numbers, equipment, organization, and methods make that impossible. An army must be gathered, trained, equipped, to meet the situation. But this is what we call war.

To refuse on any ground to meet the situation thus created is to abandon the State. It is to deny and surrender the primary functions for which it came into existence, and without whose fulfilment it simply does not exist. It is here that the honor of a nation becomes involved with its duty. The killing of the invading enemy is a necessary form of the fulfilment of that duty. In the circumstances described, punishment cannot be inflicted, the State cannot carry out its inherent task, without inflicting that penalty. The pacifist who insists

that the State should rather perish than kill is saying rather that it becomes wrong for a State to exist as soon as it is attacked by an enemy. It must consent to die whensoever an organized foreign foe appears within its borders. No argument will ever make this program of conduct appear reasonable to the vast majority of Christian men. They will always feel that somewhere in it there is contained a fallacy, a misinterpretation of the meaning and of the effect of sacrifice, a misrepresentation or miscalculation of the duty of the State, a failure to compare truly the fulfilment of its task in that act of killing which is necessary under these circumstances, with the fulfilment of that task among its own citizens.

The pacifist mode of thought seems to surrender the whole world of moral considerations which are implied in the existence of the State, for the one theory that it can never be right under any circumstances to inflict death upon any man. The duty of the State to safeguard its citizens, the sense of honor involved in the defence of its duty, the noble instinct of the human soul to protect the weak and prevent the wicked from attaining their ends—these are all cast aside in order to avoid the one fact, which is indeed a dreadful, but here an inevitable, fact, the putting of the criminal to death. Frankly, it comes to be a weighing of alternatives in the light of their moral content

and the significance of their future for the Kingdom of God and the welfare of mankind—whether it is a greater or holier thing for a State to allow its citizens to be destroyed by murderous invaders or to repel their purpose by putting them to the death which they seek to inflict. Death at human hands will eventuate in either case. Is the mere act of killing, of putting an end to the life of a man, itself so inherently sinful that it cannot be considered in relation to any purpose had in view, to any results which may flow from it? From all this it seems to be the one conclusion which the most sincere Christian thinker ought to reach that a country has the same right to fight invaders from another country as it has to put down by force its own criminals; and if in order to do this the infliction of death is inevitable, then the function of the State clears it of guilt in the matter, turns the act into a solemn duty.

It is an obvious corollary from this that another country has not only the right but has it as a most sacred obligation to aid the country which has thus been invaded, to rid itself of the enemy and to punish him for the breach of international rights.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup> "Every nation should be an armed nation, not because it regards any other with hostility, not because it imagines that any other has an interest in assaulting it, but because its own soil, its own language, its own laws, its own government, are given to it and are beyond all measure precious to it." F. D. Maurice, "Social Morality." 2d Ed., p. 191.

3. Of course in writing all this we have in view constantly the supreme event in modern history, which at once illustrates the depths to which a State may descend when it invades a land, and the heights to which another State may go when it seeks in the name of righteousness and of God to maintain the order, the freedom of its citizens. Belgium had exactly the same obligations to resist Germany when the German soldiers were within her border as to punish her own criminals; and Great Britain and France, apart from all questions of danger to themselves, had a moral obligation to intervene for the protection of a neighboring State, in the fulfilment of a divine obligation. Even without that solemn covenant or treaty which bound both countries to do this thing, and even if there had been no further danger incurred by themselves, when Germany set out brutally to overwhelm and absorb the Belgian people and State, it was a righteous act for Great Britain and France to prevent the crime and to maintain the existence, integrity, and honor of the Belgian people.

These are the deep and universal moral principles which underlie the action of America in her entry upon the war. First, she was actually invaded, for her own citizens and property were attacked against all law and all human considerations when her ships were sunk, her citizens drowned. It certainly aggravates the crime of Germany, and

casts a luster upon the will of this people, that it was only after a long series of protests against the German policy and when every means of avoiding the issue had been carefully and deliberately employed, that the Government of America at last found itself face to face with a duty which it could not escape without surrendering the very meaning of government and losing the sense not merely of national security but of that sacred and intensely Christian thing, national honor. It is an added, although not the primary consideration, and one which adds a high and generous zest to her great undertaking, that America found herself side by side with nations which were in danger of being overwhelmed. The foe against which they struggle acts, as we shall see later, with flawless consistency and tremendous energy upon a theory of national life which at crucial points is the direct contradiction of that which we have adopted and described in these pages, and which we believe to represent in the main the spirit, the conscience, the will of all the other great nations of the world. It is in pursuit of ends which no Christian civilization can tolerate as a permanent element in human history that the German Empire entered upon this war. It is in meeting the assault not merely of one State upon another, but of one reasoned system of morality, which is deeply immoral, upon a system of morality which is founded on conscience

enlightened by the will of God through the mind of Christ, that America fights beside Great Britain and France. On the outcome of the struggle the future of righteousness depends.

4. If we pursue the argument to the end it works out in this way. If the invaded State submits with only verbal protest, with only an appeal to the law and judgment of God and to the better self, the conscience, of the foe, it refuses to do its essential duty in the suppression of crime within its borders. And the refusal is then based on the fact that the criminals are foreign and powerful. That is what the State of Luxemburg did when German hordes poured into its territory across the Rhine. And none has called her act sublime.<sup>3</sup> Further, if the State proceeds, not believing perhaps in capital punishment, to arrest the invaders and to imprison them, and refuses to smite them lest they should die, its representatives will certainly themselves be killed and the invaders will quell the land. If, still further, seeing the futility and wickedness and weakness of all this, the State determines to do all it can to put down this lawlessness within its borders, to fulfil its sacred duty as the guardian of moral order, it must create a force which shall be able to execute capital punishment upon the so-called invading army—which is only a traditional name for criminals, for murderers, ravishers, and

---

<sup>3</sup> See below, pp. 94-96.

robbers within its own borders. Whatever dignity they may claim, these terms describe accurately the invading soldiers from the point of view of the invaded nation. The resisting force it creates is called an army, and its operations are called war. But a State using such a force and for such an end in such a spirit is simply carrying out to the limit of its power the duty inherent in its nature, the essential task for which, in the will of God and in the nature of man's life, it was created.

This is no mere recondite and subtle argument. This is exactly what happened when Belgium was ruthlessly trampled under foot by the German armies, and, losing her life for a while, saved her soul; while Luxemburg, saving her life, lost it.

The Armenians for long centuries lay at the mercy of the Turkish Empire, unarmed, meek, helpless. If any appeal to the generosity of human nature could be imagined more direct, more pathetic, more prolonged, let it be named and described. Yet even today the Moslem Government is carrying on the work of systematic massacre and complete abolition of that race. *It is not true that a State can save its life from an enemy by submission and trust and sacrifice.* The Russians the other day, or rather the Bolsheviki acting in their name, flung themselves at the feet of Germany, unarmed, appealing to the pledged word, the sense of honor of a great military Empire; and immediately all

promises were broken, all honor denied its claims, all mercy treated as ignoble weakness, and whole regions brought under the ruthless domination of a pitiless invader. *It is not true that a State can save its life from an enemy by submission and trust and sacrifice*, if the enemy has made itself deliberately impervious to any moral appeal.

The fact is that a great deal, if not all of the argument for non-resistance urged on religious and Christian grounds, arises from a confusion of two separate and divine institutions, namely, the State and the Church. We shall try in later pages to describe the mutual relation of these supreme institutions in human life. Suffice it to say here in brief that while sacrifice is essential to the life and growth, and is an inherent duty, of the Church,<sup>4</sup> it is fatal to the State. While the use of force is essential to the functions of the State, necessary to the healthful and beneficent discharge of its duty, it is fatal to the Church. Force and sacrifice are both methods of God, as Christianity has at last made known in its Gospel to the world. In God they are both exercised with that perfection of wisdom which is His alone. In human society as a whole their operation has become assigned to two different institutions. The same men must, or ought to, live and work wholeheartedly in each, out of which devotion, if it become universal in

---

<sup>4</sup> See below, pp. 94-96, 114-117.

sincerity and constancy of soul, the perfect race of man would swiftly and gloriously emerge, like a noontide sun. In the meantime we must be content to live in the bewildering twilight which our partial consecration, infected and limited by our selfish and callous hearts, prolongs. And the result is that we must serve the State with its use of force, and the Church with its use of sacrifice, aware that in our world as it is, each is difficult of fulfilment, each is obscure in its effect, yet both being more widely and fully exercised today than yesterday, ■ brighter tomorrow is being prepared for our race.

**THE GERMAN MILITARIST DOCTRINE  
OF THE STATE**



## CHAPTER IV

### THE GERMAN MILITARIST DOCTRINE OF THE STATE

We must reckon now with a very different conception of the State from that which we have described above. For there has arisen in our modern world a system of government which is founded more openly and deliberately upon a definite theory than any other known to history except the United States of America. And in most of the fundamental principles on which they are based these two governments stand in complete and irreconcilable hostility to one another. It is true that the world owes much to German students of political science, and that many of them would repudiate almost *in toto* the theory, policy, and spirit of the German Empire of today. But another group has gained the mastery, and it is their position with its consequences which we must examine partially in this chapter.

1. There is one strong characteristic of the German mind which we must remember if we would understand in part how it has come to hold opinions and engage in practices from which the

rest of the world recoils. This characteristic, at once its glory and its supreme danger, is its strict adherence to the faith in ideas and in their logical applicability to history. When it has laid hold of an abstract statement as being the essential truth, it has no hesitation, rather a great joy, in deducing from it all possible logical conclusions and applying them without fear upon fields of inquiry or action. It has been trained to take the consequences of this, alike in the work of a philosopher or a theologian in his study, and of a statesman dealing with national life. The latter in Germany boasts of dealing always with the actual and of attaining dazzling results by his close attention to the facts before him. Nevertheless he is ever guided by, generally he is the slave of, some abstract principle, or even some term, which he uses as a key to the facts and a guide in his endeavors.

This method receives a vivid, and in its results a lurid, illustration in the use which the German militaristic school have made of the doctrine that the essence of the State is "the Will to Power." The history of the phrase must go back at least to the emphasis which Hegel put upon the "will" in his theory of the State. This has been by some criticized as a defect (so Bluntschli), but treated by others as if it were the supreme merit in Hegel's philosophy of the State; the fact being that he

was careful to recognize other elements of human nature as entering into the State in addition to the mere will of man.

Another word was emphasized by Bluntschli in his famous work, when he said, "The State must have *power* in order to maintain its independence and to enforce its decrees. It is only as possessing power that a State can exist and live."<sup>1</sup> But we must remember that that very careful thinker balanced this with many other equally true, but modifying utterances; as, for instance, when he says on the same page, "the forces of moral and political development shall not be opposed to the destiny of humanity." But there has arisen in Germany a school which has maintained that the central and essential nature of the State is "the will to power." And from that unmodified statement, the combination of the phraseology of Hegel and Bluntschli, they have drawn the most astonishing logical conclusions and have used them to produce the most appalling practical results in history.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> "The Theory of the State," p. 321.

<sup>2</sup> Some maintain that Nietzsche's phrase "the will to power" is derived from Schopenhauer's doctrine of "the will to live." But the doctrine of the will has received a rich development since the days of Kant and Hegel; and the theory that "power" is the supreme characteristic of the State, so fully worked by Treitschke, combined with it naturally to make Nietzsche's phrase "the will to power" strike fire in imperialistic minds among the leaders of thought and action.

Let us trace some lines of this logical process, those which concern us especially in this discussion.

2. While the possession of power is essential to the existence of the State, it must be used always for the good of the people as a whole. The State must undertake the full task of guidance and control, in defining the highest good, in seeking to promote it, and in defending its citizens in the pursuit and possession of their national well-being. From certain points of view the German Government has carried out this program with magnificent results. We cannot here tell the story of its lavish encouragement of science, its effective municipal government. It has even taken in hand, to direct and control, the higher life of the people in respect of art and religion. No side of human interest has been neglected which could be employed to create a unified nation, conscious of dependence upon the supreme governing authorities, rendering to them a grateful obedience and an unlimited confidence, nourishing the consciousness of a distinct and unequalled destiny.

It is true, of course, that the remarkable success of this German system of government has not satisfied its people entirely. The Social Democratic movement, however its leaders have betrayed it since the inception of war, did express an ever-widening yearning of the heart for another kind of freedom, for a government where the people

could themselves speak and be conscious of directing their own destinies. And some indeed maintain that the dread of this movement on the part of the rulers of Germany was one of those forces which drove them into war. But uneasiness of conscience in some, devotion to more humane ideals in other, sections of the German people have proved to be powerless before the steady, systematic, tyrannous pressure of the will which pursued the ideals we have set forth.

That which has given the German form of national organization its peculiar significance is the fact that it was organized by a government which conceived of itself primarily as a military force, which looked out upon the world through the eyes of military leaders, which considered every side of the national life as contributing something more or less directly to the efficiency of the armies of Germany. Teachers in the primary schools were raising generations of soldiers, preachers from the pulpit were inspiring German ideals, men of science were employed to investigate every device that would add to the power of a fighting force, as well as to the power of industry and commerce. The Emperor in one of his speeches said that the army was the main prop on which the life of the nation rested. He himself did as much as anyone to turn it from a mere prop of a great structure into the rudder of a vessel sailing out on a great

adventure. The King of militant Prussia was the Emperor, director of German destiny.

3. We should never forget, in discussing the progress of the German Empire, that there were great and deep defects in its system, defects which were making themselves manifest with increasing force as the Government developed its authority and established its policy. In fact the efficiency was outward and physical in its principal forms; the defects were in the structure of life. The workingmen cherished no gratitude for the industrial efficiency to which they had been trained; and the almost socialistic laws which were supposed to care for their old age and their days of sickness did not appease them. In spite of these blessings, they were conscious of their poor wages, their political helplessness, their social disabilities. Everywhere the spirit that was in them found itself hemmed in, compelled to practice only the virtues of unlimited obedience and submission. Even the development of the mighty army and the glorification of the military career cast its shadow upon the spiritual life of the people. The prestige of the officer class tended to disparage those careers which until 1870 had been considered the supreme objects of ambition by the young men of Germany. The enormous and very rapid development of industry concentrated the attention of the people thus suddenly enriched upon money and the pleas-

ures which it could buy. The whole people were like some families whom sudden wealth drives into materialism of spirit which destroys the soul. On the other hand the efficient local government could not conceal the fact from close observers that there were deep diseases hidden under a fair surface. In Berlin before the war there were 40,000 one-room homes, whereas in London, whose slums Germans were taught to despise, with its population many times larger than that of Berlin, there were only 12,000 one-room homes. Only the strictest police control could have concealed the fact that such misery existed in Berlin. But it is just the maintenance of police control which on the one hand produces superficial good results and on the other creates a universal feeling of restrictedness, of humiliation, of irritation, which does not help to produce a noble personal bearing and a generous social spirit.

4. On the educational side the development of intellectual power was not equalled by attention to the development of character. So far as character was dealt with, it was the character of a boy who looks forward to the service of his Kaiser, the career of one who makes wealth or makes war, or gains distinction in official life. Between these his mind must choose, and his spirit was impelled in too prevailing a measure to the standards and ideals which such careers suggested to him. Even

academic careers became tainted, and the Church an expression of the imperial spirit. The relentless thoroughness with which the very effectual educational process was carried on seems to have tended towards the elaboration of the memory and the logical faculties at the expense of other powers of the mind, and the process was so relentless that German observers traced to it the increasing number of child suicides which caused anxiety in high places.

But a character was actually being formed through fifty years of imperial policy. A character had become familiar already all over the world, which stands revealed and confessed in the making of the war and in the publications by which the Germans have sought to justify it and to inspire each other for its prosecution to a victorious end. The main feature of this national character may be summarized in the phrase, "unparalleled self-esteem." They came to believe that Germany had manifested powers beyond those of any other race or nation, that in every department of life they excelled all others; and that the providence of God which allowed them to develop later than other nations intended them as the perfect flower of human evolution to exercise authority over all other inferior races and peoples. This consciousness of surpassing excellence tended to aggravate the craving for power. The matter has been well

put by Dr. Bang in that work which has thrown so lurid a light upon one side of the life of the German people:<sup>3</sup> "In Germany, such a craving for power, such a worship of mere strength, has taken root and grown, that the claim of right to be the determining factor in international relations has been entirely pushed aside. A colossal and ever increasing self-admiration, a belief in the glory of all things German, the surpassing merits of the German nature (*Wesen*), which alone has the right to rule in the world, a cynical, brutal assertion that in relation to this claim all existing treaties, all appeals to international law, all consideration for the weaker peoples, are of no significance whatever—all this we have witnessed with shuddering astonishment. This German claim is to be enforced, of course, for the true welfare of the world, but if necessary against the will of the whole world, by the aid of sheer violence. This *is* barbarism unadorned."<sup>4</sup>

5. The possession of power by a nation, taken along with the effectiveness with which it develops the life of its own people, is the measure of its right to deal forcibly with other nations, alike for its own interest and for theirs. This means, of course, that a nation has always the

<sup>3</sup> "Hurrah and Hallelujah, The Teaching of Germany's Poets, Prophets, Professors, and Preachers, A Documentation," by J. P. Bang, D.D., Professor at the University of Copenhagen.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 18.

right, if it has the power, to seek the well-being of its own people at the cost of other peoples; with the subjoined ethical defense that it will in this way convey the blessing of its higher attainments to the people whom it conquers. From this point of view the Germans, over a wide section of their intelligent people, have been taught to cherish the idea that they, as a people, must use their power in order that the whole world may receive the blessing of their national civilization. It is strange that this idea should have arisen in the hearts of some thinkers and poets long before the Empire was founded. Dr. Bang in the work already quoted (p. 35) has described the influence of one of these poets, Geibel, whose famous distich has exercised an enormous influence over the thought of the people. It has been quoted probably hundreds of times in every direction during the war. Dr. Bang's book, in its citation of opinions, is able to give us a glimpse of the extent to which these extraordinary words have convinced and inspired the leaders of the people:

*“Und es mag am deutschen Wesen  
Einmal noch die Welt genesen.”*

The words may be translated: “The world may yet be healed by the German nature.”

We are familiar with the utterances of speakers and poets who in other lands arouse the patriotic

devotion of their people by enthusiastic reviews of their history and descriptions of their position in the world. Utterances like these as expressions of national joy, pride, and hope have their real value, and a certain moral beauty; but among the Germans these sayings have been made essential parts of the program of the nation. If, as the Kaiser in an exalted moment said in 1905, "We are the salt of the earth," then the German concludes that he must sprinkle the salt over the whole surface of the earth. If the German nature can be a healing benefit to mankind, it must be forced upon the sick patient which mankind is. If German culture has produced astonishing results at home, how good and great a thing it would be to produce the same astonishing results in every other land. From thoughts like these the German has quickened in himself a sense of duty to the world. He has sanctified as a pious endeavor the will to power and a determination to expand the dominions of Germany until she shall cease to be merely a great power and become a world power.<sup>5</sup>

Yet another element in the situation must be brought forward. The German people have multiplied with great rapidity. The population was found to be too dense to be supported within the home territories. Millions of Germans had left

---

<sup>5</sup> For the distinction between these two ideas see Bluntschli, "The Theory of the State," p. 321.

for other lands. They had settled in North America and South America and Australia. They had disappeared into the life of other nations, come under the control of other governments. Germany looked upon this as a loss over which she must mourn, a wrong which she must correct. The mission of Germany in the world will be limited, its full exercise prevented unless Germany can follow her sons overseas, and retain them under the imperial system to count as Germans still, expressions all around the world of her glory, nourishers of her life. To the logical German mind again this seemed to suggest, nay even to impose, the duty of following her emigrants even by force, fighting all opposition, that the Fatherland might still retain the control of its far-wandering children.

These various lines of thought are not themselves wrong, except in the aggressive deductions. Other nations have sought to develop themselves to the utmost, other nations have colonies, other nations have expanded their civilization over neighboring peoples and into distant portions of the world. Spain, in South America, Great Britain and her dominions and the Indian Empire, France and every region in the world that is counted to her credit, even that young nation, the United States of America, with its West Indies and its Philippine Islands—these have all given the blessings of their civilization to great portions of the world, and in

doing so they have all undoubtedly received the richer development of their own national life. But Germany, confronted with the situation, forming these ambitions and intensifying them to a degree of white heat, found herself without a world which she could conquer, without the opportunity in which she had been prevented by other nations. There remained only one possible way, it seemed to her, of achieving what other peoples had achieved, the way of war. But this dream of war under the circumstances meant the conquering of other strong empires. And the contemplation of that idea in the mind of the Kaiser, as his speeches abundantly show, and at last in the almost official declarations of von Bernhardt, grew into a conception of world domination. Germany could not win her way to the place occupied by the countries we have named except by conquering one or all of them; and conquering them meant raising herself above them to a height they had not reached, and exercising a world influence they had not exercised. The dream to us seems ghastly, to them it seemed heavenly in its inspiring force.

The development of German power might have gone along other lines which already it was pursuing. A more spiritually-minded race might have said: "In commerce we are catching up and will soon pass them all, in science, in art, in the ways of an orderly home government, we are leaders

of the world. This is glory, this is *essential* power, this is what we are really giving to humanity. Let us continue the gift even when it means the sending abroad large numbers of our people to live elsewhere." This is the very essence of power when it is interpreted in the supreme terms, which are moral and spiritual. And this is what the earlier German men of letters and philosophers meant when they spoke of the preeminence of Germany among the peoples of the world.

But in our day Prussia had gained control of Germany. Her extraordinary growth had been frankly created by her devotion to military power. In the latter part of the nineteenth century the aggrandizement of that warlike race proceeded with great strides. She conquered Denmark, absorbed Hanover, brought Austria to her feet. Then she tore away valuable portions of fair France. It seemed as if there were no limits to her power in the pursuance of military ideals and the continuance of the military spirit as cherished in Prussia for centuries.

6. These two great streams of history, character, and national interest in Germany coalesced. The passion for the development of a worthy national life was united with the forceful energy of a Prussian militarism. Hence there arose the modern conception of war which, while no doubt rejected by many intelligent and spiritually-minded Germans,

yet became the dominant influence in its life, directed its policy at home and abroad, created the empire of unparalleled military efficiency and energy, and drove it into the World War.

First, we must begin with a certain abstract principle which may be stated as follows: The essence of the State is power, the supreme manifestation of power is war. Therefore the State must ever make itself fit for war. Or in this way: War is the manifestation of power, the result of war is the determination of the right of a nation to dictate terms to the conquered. The conquered has no right except that of submission, the conqueror no duty except that of gathering the full fruits of victory.

Second, war being an essential of national life, it must be necessary to the health of the people. "The efforts directed towards the abolition of war must be termed not only foolish, but absolutely immoral, and must be stigmatized as unworthy of the human race."<sup>6</sup> "War is an instrument of progress, a regulator in the life of humanity, an indispensable factor in civilization, a creative force."<sup>7</sup> "Our people must learn to see that the maintenance of peace never can or may be the goal of a policy. . . . The inevitableness, the idealism, and the blessings of war, as an indispensable

---

<sup>6</sup> Von Bernhardt, "How Germany Makes War," p. 34.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 2.

and stimulating law of development, must be repeatedly emphasized.”<sup>8</sup>

Third, the conduct of a war is part of the struggle for existence, which is a law of nature, as Darwinism has revealed to the modern world. According to this doctrine, real evolution from the lower to the higher forms of life depends on the conquest of the weak by the strong. War, therefore, is the manifestation in human life of this deep, divine principle. “Might is at once the supreme right, and the dispute as to what is right is decided by the arbitrament of war. War gives a biologically just decision, since its decisions rest on the very nature of things.”<sup>9</sup> “But it [war] is not only a biological law, but a moral obligation, and as such, an indispensable factor in civilization.”<sup>10</sup>

Fourth, German writers are quoted abundantly by Dr. Bang who have striven to bring this conception of war into relation with Christianity. This is not the place to make quotations, but it may be right to say that after a careful reading of these and of numerous similar passages to be found elsewhere in the literature of the war, the judgment must be recorded that seldom in the checkered history of Christian thought has a mass of opinion been expressed that can equal this in

---

<sup>8</sup> Von Bernhardi, “Germany and the Next War,” p. 37.

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 23.

<sup>10</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 24.

the qualities which we may summarize as grotesque, immoral, and blasphemous. Every one of these hard adjectives can be easily justified by a scrutiny of the writings referred to.

7. This whole view of war is in direct contrast to that which we have in earlier pages described and defined. It derives itself from abstractions, it seeks to justify itself by past history and imperfect scientific theories. There is nothing more dangerous in our world than the tyranny of abstract ideas, of the use of terms not carefully defined and limited by application of them to the manifold circumstances of life, where they only partially apply. On the general conception described above, the following points of criticism must in the meantime be sufficient:

First, whatever truth is in the statement that some wars have brought blessings in the past does not in the least prove war to be a permanent and essential condition of progress. When the nations have been raised to higher levels of life and brought under the guidance of moral principles which were inoperative in earlier periods of history, the spirit and practice of war must depress and degrade.

Second, this doctrine, if practiced by all nations, would concentrate the whole world upon war as the supreme good. Every other side of life would be organized and made subservient to this. It is one thing for a German military philosopher to

argue as von Bernhardi does, in order to encourage the uneasy conscience of his people living in a peaceable world, or a world that desires peace. The picture of one supremely powerful military power is the picture before their minds. It is quite another thing when one calmly pictures a world of nations, every one of which holds the doctrine of von Bernhardi. It would be a world made up of armed nations, of vast organizations of life, all of which found their true meaning and unified effect in the efficiency of their military establishments; and these establishments would have to be co-extensive with the total activities of the peoples. This appalling picture means the destruction of all moral ideals, the expulsion of the Christian spirit, the erection of a kingdom of evil as wide as the world and as deep as man's devotion to war.

Third, this whole conception of a world universally ordered for war would establish as the ultimate moral truth the doctrine defended by von Bernhardi regarding the struggle for existence, in which the fittest would always be the victorious army. This is the negation of all right. It must be pronounced the most inhuman, the most anti-Christian view of human nature which can be fashioned by an evil and distorted imagination. The present situation in Europe is an illustration of what the dethroning of righteousness and the enthroning of force would mean for the whole world.

Fourth, it is certain that humanity will not accept this doctrine. It may be that it is difficult for us to anticipate the manner in which the human race can maintain virility without war, can nourish the passion of patriotism without the rivalries that hitherto have led to war, can manifest the fulness of sacrifice without the free offering of soldiers in battle. But this question is one which we may well leave to the future. The spirit of man has not shown itself without resources; there are no doubt within it as yet unsuspected, undiscovered wellsprings of life. There may yet be developed tasks as great as war which will call out sacrifice, nourish virility, stimulate the spirit of adventure. What these may be, how they will shape themselves, what ends of pursuit will be involved, and what price the struggle will demand, we cannot as yet imagine. But beyond the present horizon these things lie. What we have to deal with today is the fundamental fact that he enthrones might without mercy, force without righteousness, who conceives of the development of a people only in terms of war, with all its ruthless results. He has lost the vision of that Kingdom of God which the Christian faith has urged us to believe is the destiny of man.<sup>11</sup>

---

<sup>11</sup> The extent to which the conscience even of Christian men has been confused and blinded by the military ambition of the German Empire is nowhere more lamentably illustrated than in the recent published utterances of an eminent theologian and

brilliant writer, Professor Ernst Troeltsch of Heidelberg. An apparently trustworthy account of his opinions as given in the year 1917 in a conversation at Heidelberg has been published by Professor Charles S. Sherrington of Oxford.

On being asked why war should be a necessity, since no one in England thought of making war on Germany, Professor Troeltsch said:

"The War is a necessity for Germany because England has so much that it is absolutely necessary for Germany to possess in order to fulfil her rôle as a world State."

Being asked what were the possessions which Germany so much desired, Professor Troeltsch said:

"Ports and colonies in many parts of the world—Australia, South Africa, Hongkong, India. England is not really strong, but there has been no strong power to dispute these great sources of wealth with her. These sources of wealth must fall to a new world power, and that is clearly Germany." . . . "But England as a political influence is becoming effete; her governments exemplify that; they exhibit little insight into world-politics today. When our navy is larger than the English it will be too late for England to interfere, and the opportunity will rest with Germany. The day for the decision of England's fate will then come quickly."

# THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH



## CHAPTER V

### THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH

Hitherto we have been discussing the institution called the State, especially in relation to the fact of war. We have tried to establish the position that war as a defensive measure for the protection of the rights of its citizens is one of the essential functions of the State. It arises from the necessity for the maintenance of a moral order within its territory, on the basis of which the national life is to proceed.

We have also examined briefly the doctrine of the State and of war which has been promulgated by the limitless ambition and the uneasy conscience of German leaders. The program which they describe would result, we believe, in the destruction of all morality within any nation which deliberately and thoroughly adopts it. And if it were made the program of all nations and carried out over the face of the earth, it would create a condition from the very imagination of which heart and mind must shrink back in amazement and horror.

1. There is another institution in the world,

the Church of Christ, with whose nature and influence we must now reckon; for we cannot understand the life of a community without understanding its religion, and throughout Christendom religion depends upon the existence and work of the Church. In early times religion was looked upon simply as one phase of the life of the community, as a whole, one function of the State. The chief of a tribe was very often its priest. Only with the fuller development of the life of a people has a distinction been drawn between the organization of the people for religious ends and their organization for temporal and secular ends.<sup>1</sup>

When Jesus began His ministry, the Jewish people existed mainly as a Church, while the functions of the State rested in the representatives of imperial Rome. The political situation in Palestine was extremely complicated. There were four main political sections: first the Roman authorities, second the party of the Sadducees, third the party of the Pharisees, fourth the party of the Herodians. At every point the principles on which Jesus founded His own policy came into competition with the principles or policy of one or other of these parties. His principles laid an emphasis on individuality, on the infinite value of each human personality, which has proved itself one of the deepest forces

---

<sup>1</sup> The progress of this development is best illustrated in the history of Israel from Moses to the death of Christ.

in the creation of the modern, the Christian world. But in His ministry He was not dealing, as we too often suppose, merely with individuals, irrespective of their social and political environment. He was deliberately creating a new community, whose nature would bring it into contact with every other human institution.

The Church of Christ was not founded and did not come into full consciousness as a distinctive community until after His death and resurrection. Without these events it cannot be conceived to exist. They are among the primary forces which produced it, and their permanent power is one of the vital conditions of its continued existence. When the Church did come into conscious being as a distinct community, it became speedily identified as a new and mighty fact in human history. Roman statesmen ere long saw in it a foe more subtle than any which they had ever encountered, an institution whose very nature made it, as history has proved, invincible before even the breadth and force of Roman statesmanship.

2. We may briefly define the Church for our present purpose as that community of human beings of all races and classes who are brought together by reason of their ardent faith in Jesus Christ as their Saviour and Lord, and whose lives are spent in obedience to His law in the practical manifestation of His spirit of universal love.

Two of the great characteristics of this community, which we may name as relevant to our present task, are that in its essence it is unworldly and international or inter-racial. By the former we mean not merely that its source is spiritual, but that the whole meaning of its existence is to be found in the moral and spiritual sphere. It may possess buildings, but it does not exist for them and can exist without them. Its continued life may be nourished by the variety of its institutional arrangements and its influence upon humanity enlarged by them, but if these institutions bring it into the exercise of merely earthly policies and the pursuit of earthly gains, its spirit is wronged, its reality is brought into doubt. It is international in the sense that it draws its members on equal terms from literally all classes of human beings, and seeks to bring them into a conscious fellowship with one another which cannot be equaled by any other institution, not even by the State.

These facts do not mean that it has no relation with the actual world. Rather is it true that the more intensely it realizes its spiritual nature and pursues its spiritual ends, the more powerfully does it produce its characteristic and ennobling effect upon human life. As a distinct social community it necessarily comes into comparison and contact with other social institutions. It has interacted with them from the beginning of its history to this

day. It has been influenced by their spirit, and it has, wherever its true functions have been exercised, exerted immeasurable influence upon their character.

3. Especially has the Church from the beginning been related to the State, in whatever form the latter existed in any country, in any period of history. No more than its Master can it escape that relationship. Slowly did it emerge through what we now call Christendom, as the one supreme organization of men whose ideal is to gather all the citizens of a nation, and even the citizens of all nations, into conscious mutual relationships of trust and love and service under its own inspiration and direction. Thus in its empire over the spiritual life it alone stands comparison with, and is vitally related with, the State in its empire over the temporal relations of men.

The ideal relationship of the Church to the State is somewhat simple of description, though the actual history has been extremely complicated. Its purpose, and where it is powerful its actual effect, is to stimulate the ethical ideals of the community as a whole, to purify the purposes of the government, to give energy to every political and social force that seeks to extend justice and mercy throughout the community, to encourage all efforts to elevate the entire life of the nation. It is under the influence of the Church that the very fact of

war has been brought increasingly under severe criticism and condemnation. If today men hate war, if they have ceased to consider, in most Christian lands, that it is a necessity of human life, if efforts have been made to moralize the methods of warfare between modern nations, these influences can be traced directly to the teaching and spirit of the Church of Christ. One of its most powerful and subtle influences is to be found in the fact that men who deny the claims of the Church yet cling to its ethical and social ideals as if these were primeval and indisputable possessions of the human spirit. But it is one of the glories of the Christian religion that its fundamental teachings about man have thus come to be accepted as if they were inevitable and inalienable. As a matter of fact, their meaning has been only laboriously discovered and their tenure of the human heart must always be insecure unless the force which revealed them also retains them in the hearts of men. Neither that discovery nor that tenure is yet complete.

4. Throughout the history of the Church it has always appealed to the New Testament, that is, to the teaching and example of Christ and His Apostles, as the primary and supreme interpreter of its nature and its task in the world. To these writings, the only writings of the ancient world that dominate the life of today, and that with ever widening influence, we must go for light upon

the specific question before us: What is the relation of the Church to the State when the State engages in war? First, we must try to discover something of the relations in which Christ set Himself towards the State, the organized life of the people among whom He lived and worked.<sup>2</sup>

In the first place, a close study of the gospels reveals the fact that Jesus was involved in a struggle with Jewish political parties in the work of establishing His community. After vain dealings with the Jewish authorities themselves, there was nothing for Him to do but to draw to Himself individuals whom He gradually moulded into a distinct community. He established this community on a purely spiritual basis, releasing it from any relation to or dependence upon any political party in the land. This was a daring thing to do, and it cost Him His life.

But in the second place, a close scrutiny of His life and teaching reveals the fact that He was consciously creating His community with relation to the background of social organization. He did not attempt to draw His followers into a desert place to form a separate community. He left them in their natural human, social, and even national relations. His teaching has constant

---

<sup>2</sup> This subject has been recently investigated in a work called "The Political Relations of Christ's Ministry," by Stephen Liberty, M.A. (University Press, Oxford), an original and penetrating study of the subject.

reference of a genial and positive nature to the world in which they live, the business life of an ordered community, the functions of judges, the homes from which His disciples came and to which they returned, the institution of the synagogue. These and other facts are present as accepted elements in the life of His community. He assumes that the community will continue in the midst of the world, hence His parables of the tares and of the good and bad fish brought to shore in the net. His very teaching concerning the nature and uses of wealth presupposes the continued activity of His disciples in their natural social relations. There is not the slightest suggestion of a separatist spirit in His teaching, so far as the relation of His community to the life of the whole people is concerned. Rather do we find that He treats as a matter of great personal grief the fact that He had been rejected by the city of Jerusalem, by the rulers and leaders of the people. He even prophesies that this rejection will have as one of its results the transfer of the power, which they greedily grasped and misused, to the hands of an alien power. He seems to have given full warning that the failure of the leaders of Israel to establish their community on purely spiritual lines, would mean not only the abolishing of their earthly power in whatever minor ways it still survived, but the loss of their spiritual destiny in the life of the race. As He

looks into the future He foresees the continuance of national history, nation fighting with nation, He sees His own disciples confronting the hostility of the powers that be, brought before governors and kings for their allegiance to His authority.

In the third place, it is of especial interest and importance to see how Jesus related Himself with the Roman Government, the *de facto* authority in Palestine. First, He avoided identifying His movement with any form of religious revolutionary method. This means that He accepted and understood that His disciples would live under the authority of the State in the form of the Roman Empire. Next, as we have already pointed out, He warned the Jews that the history of States is under the governance of God, and that the policy they pursued would decide whether He would continue them in authority or give that authority to others. Further, he accepted the Roman Government by entering into friendly relations with and approving the faith of men who were in the service of the State. People complained that He made friends of tax-gatherers, and it is one of the outstanding events of His ministry that He blessed the faith of the centurion. Now Thomas Barclay, whose "Apology" is recognized as one of the leading authorities among the Society of Friends, urges that there is no proof that the centurion on exercising this faith in Christ and receiving His blessing did not

leave the army at once. It is a fact that there is no proof, but the negative argument is always dangerous; and here it loses sight of the main point. For where Jesus was dealing with a man or woman leading a wrong life, He always said, "Go and sin no more." There is no indication of that here. He does not seem to have forbidden Zaccheus to continue in the service of the State. If the continuance of relations with a military authority were sin for the centurion, it would be impossible that He should not have acted upon the fact. And such action would have been so significant that it could not have escaped a place in the record.

And finally we come to the most significant of all His sayings in this direction. On one occasion the Jewish authorities, seeking to embarrass Him in His political relations, to commit Him to a declaration that would bring Him under the law, challenged Him as to whether it was right to pay taxes to the Emperor or not. Now the answer of Jesus to this question was not a merely clever retort. He did not, as so many have thought, elude the question. Rather was the question much deeper, much more far-reaching in its significance than many of us have supposed, and the answer was a much more powerful determinant of history than appears on the surface. The purpose of the question was to discover whether Jesus would

attach Himself to those who were advocating resistance to the imperial authority. On the other hand, if He approved of the payment of taxes, it would seem that He was denying the worship of the living God. For in those days it had come about that the head of the Roman Empire was spoken of as Saviour and Lord, and worship was rendered to his name. Indeed, long years after this, readiness to offer incense on the altar of the Emperor was one of the tests to which the Christian was set, and many a man and woman was done to death for refusing to worship the Emperor with a pinch of incense cast on the flame. As it has been said, "Loyalty to the State and worship of the deified head of the State became identical in the eyes of the law." This was, then, a question whose answer must make history for Him to whom they addressed it. His reply was, "Pay to Cæsar what belongs to Cæsar, and to God what belongs to God." In each direction there is a duty. The coin which He held in His hand was proof that they as citizens, as merchantmen, were indebted to Cæsar's Government for the whole order under which they lived and made their living. The tax represented their payment for the security, the order, which they enjoyed. Let this obligation, therefore, be recognized, was the decision of Jesus. Let this duty be paid to Cæsar as a moral obligation. On the other hand, Cæsar is not God. There is no

duty which any human being owes to Cæsar which can be or ought to be paid in religious worship and adoration. That is due only to the living God, Who is over Cæsar himself, the Father of all mankind. To Him the duty of the spirit must be paid in spiritual kind, as the material duty to Cæsar in material kind.

In these words Jesus finally set His seal upon the doctrine that even those citizens who belonged to His own community and were committed to the worship of God in spirit and in truth were indebted also to the State, and must be committed to the payment of all their due obligations to the ruler of the day.

5. The main arguments for pacifism, apart from questions of general ethical principle, are based upon what are considered to be the explicit teachings of Christ as given in the Sermon on the Mount. Of this discourse as a whole it must be said that it is universally regarded as among the most important declarations of moral ideals, among the most glowing revelations of the divine will, which even the Bible contains. Moreover, "In this teaching Jesus aimed at being universally intelligible; and He was so; for through the Christian centuries the kind of life which He here describes has been the guiding star of civilization."<sup>3</sup> In spite of the

---

<sup>3</sup> C. W. Votaw, Hastings's "Dictionary of the Bible," extra volume, p. 1.

fact that the teaching is intelligible and has illuminated the higher life of men, it has also caused infinite perplexity in all generations. What is very clear in statement baffles all efforts to carry it literally into obedience.

The three passages which are chiefly appealed to in support of the doctrine that under no circumstances can a Christian man take part in war are Matthew 5:21-26, 38-42, 43-48. In the first of these passages Jesus quotes the Old Testament law, "Thou shalt not kill," and interprets it as involving the deeper law that men must not cherish hatred or even scorn of one another. From this the conclusion is drawn by some that no follower of Jesus can have any part in the killing of a man under any circumstances whatsoever. Even capital punishment is thus forbidden. It is important to note, however, that the correct translation of the command in the Old Testament is, "Thou shalt do no murder." The command was uttered to a people constantly engaged in warfare. They were at all times surrounded with enemies who were ready to destroy them. Israel could not possibly have demobilized, in obedience to the command that they should kill no one under any circumstances, without being themselves utterly destroyed. When Jesus quotes the law, His development of it must be made in line with the original meaning and application of that law.

In the second passage Jesus refers to an early prescription, according to which penalties for injury to the person were to be proportioned exactly to the injury done. This, again, was a merciful piece of legislation whose intention was not to drive men to revenge, but to make the system of penalties a just one. He who lost an eye must not take two eyes from his enemy, nor should the State that inflicts punishment exaggerate it beyond that which is reasonable in the circumstances. Jesus goes on to deepen the meaning of the command, and does so by means of several successive utterances: "I say unto you, Resist not him that is evil: but whosoever smiteth thee on thy right cheek, turn to him the other also. And if any man would go to law with thee, and take away thy coat, let him have thy cloak also. And whosoever shall compel thee to go one mile, go with him two. Give to him that asketh thee, and from him that would borrow of thee turn not thou away" (Matt. 5: 39-42).

It is of great interest to note in passing that in v. 41, "Whosoever shall compel thee" would better be translated, "Whosoever shall impress thee." The word is a technical term, referring to a custom of the Roman Government, one prevalent for many ages in the East, of compelling anyone within their reach to aid in the transportation of military baggage. Jesus seems to say that if the Government compels a private citizen to serve it in this way,

he must be willing not merely to obey under compulsion, but to have a good heart in the doing of it. Oppressive as it can be made, and often was made, this custom must be accepted as a service of the State.

But the central words of the passage around which controversy has raged are in that utterance, "Resist not him that is evil." Are there no limits to that apparently limitless, absolute injunction? Does it mean that no man may exercise the office of a judge or aid the State in the arrest of evil-doers? Does it mean that no Christian man can be a policeman or a lawyer who deals with criminal affairs? Or still further, does it mean that a man must not resist even in words, since words sometimes cut more deeply than swords? Did Jesus Himself or did He not resist evil when he denounced the traffickers in the Temple and drove them forth? These are questions which must be answered by those who apply the command against the exercise of force in a Christian State, or by those who specially apply it to the one form of resisting him who is evil, which is called war.

In the third passage, Jesus says, "Love your enemies." And it is in relation to this passage that, for example, Thomas Barclay, the famous theologian of the Society of Friends, has argued, "If a magistrate be truly a Christian or desire to be so, he ought himself in the first place to obey

the command of his Master, saying, Love your enemies and then he cannot command us to kill them."

What does our Lord mean when He commands us to love our enemies? It is not He who has put these words into immediate connection with the command, "Thou shalt not kill," but only those who interpret the words as having that application. And no doubt when we understand that the word killing means murder, the command has immediate application. Indeed, one of His own apostles long afterwards echoed the two passages in one great utterance, "Whosoever hateth his brother is a murderer" (1 John 3:15).

We must remember, however, as Dr. Horton has so well pointed out recently, that in ordinary usage men make a deep and fundamental distinction between murder and the act of a soldier in battle. "The distinction between killing and murder is quite familiar to our minds, as it is familiar to every maker of laws. . . . We realize the distinction instinctively. . . . When from a personal motive, and actuated by a personal passion, a man kills another, that is murder. . . . When a soldier kills an enemy in battle, he is not actuated by any personal feeling at all, he has no personal animosity; he is simply carrying out a command which is laid upon him by the State to which he belongs. . . . While we

---

<sup>4</sup> Barclay, "Apology," Proposition 15.

entirely exonerate the soldier when he kills, we of course recognize that if that soldier kills a comrade or kills anyone else, he is immediately proceeded against as a murderer, and if he is found guilty, he is condemned to death. . . . The peculiar *gravamen* of the charge that we bring against the German Government is that it has obliterated the distinction between murder and the killing that is recognized as lawful killing in war.”<sup>5</sup>

There are many questions which might be asked of those who believe that the command, Thou shalt love thine enemy, is to be taken in the sense suggested. Does it mean that the enemy who has done wrong is not to be condemned? Does it mean that no effort is to be made to punish him? Does it mean that the State is to abdicate its right to deal with any man who acts as an enemy of other men? Does it mean that the citizens of the State are guilty of resisting the laws of Jesus if they support its action in restraining the enemies of law and order?

On the whole subject of the significance of the Sermon on the Mount with especial relation to these three passages the following observations must be made:

In the first place, it will not do to forget that political and social background which we have

---

<sup>5</sup> Robert F. Horton, D.D., in “Christ and the World at War,” pp. 74-76.

already tried to understand as we watch Jesus forming His new community. When He launches this community into history, He knows it is into the history of a world organized into human governments. He is creating the Church on spiritual foundations. He is interpreting the meaning of life as it shall be seen when various social organizations are created out of its inmost and divine spirit. But He does not attempt to lay down prescriptions for the exact manner in which His disciples are to deal with the political situation of their own day. He does not say how the members of His community, and the community as a whole, shall be related to the successive problems which must arise as it enters into the wider life of the world and into contact with all the other institutions of humanity.

In the second place, they are right who have uttered the startling opinion that literal obedience to all parts of the Sermon on the Mount would "dissolve" every government and nation in the world. We need only to look quite frankly at the rest of the Sermon in order to see the truth of this opinion. Literal obedience to the outward phraseology would actually cause the death or suicide of one institution after another. For instance, the sayings concerning wealth (Matt. 6:19, 20), if taken *au pied de la lettre* would destroy all the business in the world. Even Jesus' own company of twelve dis-

ciples would not have been able to use Judas as its treasurer and give him the bag to carry. A literal obedience to the command that we should take no careful thought about food or drink or clothing would reduce us to savagery. Communities have arisen that tried to apply literally the full meaning or suggestion of the passage concerning the relation of the sexes (Matt. 5:27-32), and have attempted to live in perpetual celibacy. This proceeding would be the suicide of the race in the most complete fashion possible. Literal obedience to the passage concerning almsgiving (Matt. 6:2, 3), would make it impossible for anyone to subscribe to any society lest someone should know that he had given something. Literal obedience to the command about the manner of prayer (Matt. 6:5, 6) would mean the abolition of public worship, and some people have actually taken this literally.

Literal obedience to the command, "Judge not," would shut down the training of children, the condemnation of the wrongdoer, even the commanding of an army, and abolish every court of law. It is no exaggeration to say that there is exactly the same amount of reason for translating these injunctions into actual conduct as those which deal with murder and the resistance of evil and the treatment of enemies.<sup>6</sup>

---

<sup>6</sup> The high-souled English Quaker, Thomas Hodgkin, the famous historian, wrote on this subject: "I also feel that if War is abso-

The real solution of the problem of the Sermon on the Mount must not be one which is created merely to satisfy the selective impulses of this group or that group, but one which interprets the purpose of Jesus Christ throughout the whole discourse. It must rest upon an understanding of the method which He employs, the spirit which He is putting into the world, and the effect of that spirit upon the history of men in their relations with society and the State, and even with the natural forces on which our physical existence rests.

6. Here I must refer to an opinion held by some that if only a nation would sacrifice itself rather than fight for its existence, it would be fulfilling the will of Christ. And some even have the audacity, shall I say the blindness, to parallel such an act by a national State with the self-sacrifice of Christ on the Cross.

Two essential facts are entirely forgotten when men speak thus of the sacrifice of Christ as an example which ought to have been followed by Belgium. In the first place, the act of Christ made no impression on the Romans who put him to death. Nor did the Jewish authorities repent of their deed,

---

lutely condemned under all circumstances by the Sermon on the Mount, Business, as we understand it, is equally condemned. . . . Except on some such principle of interpretation as I have suggested, I fear that my forty years of banking life are quite as clearly astray to the commands of Christ as Lord Roberts' forty years' campaign in India." Mrs. Creighton's "Life of Thomas Hodgkin," p. 241.

with all about it that made them a hundredfold more guilty than the imperial rulers. Christ's sacrificial death became a moral force first of all to the men who already knew and trusted and loved Him. The Cross did no good to any of His enemies till after His resurrection. That event proved to every one who believed in it that the sacrifice must have been deliberate, that the Son of God need not have died, that an Empire could not have crushed Him. Then its meaning and glory broke upon their minds and subdued their hearts, "and a great company of the priests were obedient to the faith" (Acts 6:7). Without the story of the resurrection Christ's use of non-resistance could have appeared only as "passivity, weakness, cowardice, or folly,"<sup>7</sup> and could have awakened of itself no response of faith, admiration, and love. Easter Day made Good Friday.

Mere self-sacrifice is mere suicide unless something for which it was made survives. The sublime act of Regulus when he went back from Rome to Carthage to die, was only justified and only became a moral force because it was a witness to the continued life and energy of that Roman honor in whose name he died. But if a State should attempt the sacrifice, it would resemble neither

---

<sup>7</sup> These words are taken from a keen and illuminating discussion of non-resistance from the psychologist's point of view in "Human Nature and Its Remaking," by W. E. Hocking. The chapter on "Pugnacity" should be read by all students of the ethics of war.

Regulus nor Christ. Not Regulus, because the honor which belonged to it in the protection of its people is itself dead, ignominiously surrendered to brute power. Not Christ, because the State which has consented to be destroyed has no resurrection except through a later war. Luxemburg may live again, but it will not be through the grace of a stricken conscience in the Kaiser, as he sees her prone at his feet. Her life can be restored only by the sacrifice of others in war.

7. We must pass to a brief but instructive consideration of the interpretation of Christ's teaching which is given to us by the Apostle Paul in the famous passage, Romans 13:1-10. The Apostle Paul always had some very definite reason for the successive paragraphs in his epistles; and this passage, like the words of Jesus about the tax payable to Cæsar, must have been addressed to a particular situation in the Christian community at Rome. It is certain that there must have been a group of people in that church who were inclined to withdraw themselves as completely as possible from responsibilities to the State. They may have attempted to carry into the Church the spirit of the Pharisaic party at Jerusalem, with whom Jesus dealt so drastically in His own ministry on the earth. It is to such persons that the Apostle sends this powerful and far-reaching instruction which has no parallel elsewhere in his writings. There are

three fundamental statements made which are relevant to our present subject.

In the first place, he says that the powers that be—that is, the actual governing authority of a nation—“are ordained of God.” He goes on to explain what he means by this—rulers exist simply to secure the community against evil-doers, and by their authority they encourage healthy-minded people to do that which is right. “He is a minister of God to thee for good.” This deep-seeing assertion is the justification, for a Christian believer, of the position that the State is a divine institution.

In the second place, the State which thus acts as “a minister of God,” “an avenger of wrath to him that doeth evil,” “bears the sword,” and that, he says, “not in vain” or “for nothing.” Whether the Apostle Paul today would defend capital punishment or not is an idle question. In this passage he recognized it, for when men punished with the sword in those days, they did not use the flat of it. For him that was no transgression of the command, “Thou shalt do no murder.” Nor was it a transgression of the command that we must love our enemies, if for conscience’ sake we put ourselves under the guardianship of the State, which holds the sword.

In the third place, he re-echoes the words of Jesus concerning the paying of taxes, and insists that this must be done because those to whom they

must be paid are "ministers of God's service." How complete the loyalty of the individual citizen must be to the State which protects him is summed up in the powerful phrases of verse 7, "Render to all their dues: tribute to whom tribute is due; custom to whom custom; fear to whom fear; honor to whom honor." Then he passes on, apparently without any sense of break with what he has already been saying, to urge upon his readers thorough obedience to the sublime law of love which the Saviour had brought into the world.

This teaching of the Apostle Paul is amply illustrated by his own life and example. He inherited the rights of a Roman citizen, and was proud of the privileges which thus became his as he moved over the world. When he was illegally punished at Philippi, he did not scruple to warn the breakers of the law that they might be punished; when he pled his case before Festus and before Agrippa, he stood on his rights, he appealed from the Jewish persecutors to Roman justice. When at the court in Cæsarea he had no fair trial, he claimed the supreme privilege and rights of Roman citizenship and appealed directly to the Emperor himself. Throughout the whole long and bitter experience of nearly five years' imprisonment, we know of no word uttered by him which can be interpreted as disloyalty, or indicated that because he was a Christian man he ought to avoid his

responsibilities, or forego his rights as a Roman citizen.

It would be foolish in the light of all history to conclude that the Apostle Paul in another age and when the Church had won its way to larger influence would have refused to take any part in the improvement of the form of government. When he says "the powers that be are ordained of God," he cannot be interpreted as binding the Church forever to the ideal of the State as it existed under the Emperor of that day. It is the State of any day which, so far as it sums up and cares for the life of a nation, is the ordinance of God at that time. It is human, and therefore characterized by the frailties of humanity; it is human, and therefore liable to change and subject to improvement; it is human, and therefore through human sources must its continual correction of evil and strengthening of righteousness be secured. It is in this very task of continual criticism and improvement of the methods of the State that the spirit of Jesus Christ has had such enormous and manifest influence through the Christian centuries. Due to the Church is the modern hatred of war, the modern attempts to moralize its methods, to limit the scope of its terror and destruction, to define the conditions under which alone a people may enter with a clear conscience and with the spirit of God into warfare. All the discussions of

the hour on every hand are in their sum total a glorious witness to the influence of the Sermon on the Mount and the spirit of Christ, in every form of its manifestation, upon the history of the nations, the States, the wars of the world.

8. It is not, then, through the forsaking of duty, the casting down of self-respect, the ignoring of wrongdoing, it is not through the refusal to execute righteousness at the cost of right, that the Church has secured these grand results. It is through deeper, slower, more patient, more divine ways that the body of Christ, which is the Church, is acting upon the human mass which is the world, and bringing all the nations into that new brotherhood which He alone has made possible, and which can be realized at last only when He is universally accepted and obeyed as "the Ruler of the kings of the earth."

The very obligation set forth by the Apostle to unite oneself with the government of the hour, *as a religious act*, gives us the right to inquire whether the actual wielders of power at any one time are truly carrying out the divine intent of the State as "a minister of God for good." When the rulers of the hour fail to administer justice, fail even in their conception of public right, they unfit themselves for fulfilling the ordinance of God. How and when and by what means a change is to be effected, no one can say. There is no general rule.

But it may be said that changes are always going on in the very form of government, and that inevitably every Christian man is not only free, but under religious obligation to give his influence to those changes which are directed towards the better fulfillment by the State of its fundamental task as the protector of right, justice, and freedom, of that moral order which is the will of God.

It is here that the function of the Church in relation to the State comes into clear view. History warns us with a loud voice against the intrusion of the Church as an institution into the field of politics where good men and true may differ from one another. It is as dangerous for the Church officially to seek coercion of the State as for the State to seek coercion of the Church. But the Church cannot exist, cannot do its own proper work thoroughly, without continuously acting upon the moral ideals of the nation, and quickening the public conscience. Its own work involves the pursuit of justice, charity, and freedom among its own members. To understand and value these, to receive them from God, to value them with the whole heart and soul, to practice them in the whole habit of life of the sacred, the beloved community, this is the purpose and vital work of the Church. This is the purpose and effect of all its worship, instruction, and philanthropic endeavor. But when this is thoroughly done, the entire community must

be illuminated, aroused, directed, inspired to pursue the same great principles of life within the whole sphere of the State's responsibility. The ethical history of the modern world is a witness to the power of the Christian community thus exercised. Modern democracy was born in the Christian community of the post-reformation period; the emancipation of the slave was born in the hearts of individual Christian men, who by their fire and persistence convinced whole nations; the modern treatment of prisoners is the result of the work of innumerable Christians; the ideals of universal and compulsory education were given to the modern world by Martin Luther and John Knox, nourished by the Christian communities which they inspired; the task of uplifting vast masses of mankind in non-Christian lands was not primarily undertaken by the governments of victorious and civilized lands, but by the missionaries of the cross. That the Church has failed in many directions, allowing itself to be shackled by the sins of selfishness, misused wealth, and prejudice, the members of the Church are the first to complain. But what has been done in the last three centuries to spread the light of justice, charity, and liberty in our world is due in the main, directly and indirectly, to the pervasive influence of all that has been sincere, generous, and sacrificial in the life of the communities of Christ in all lands.

In the very matter of war it is the Christian spirit which has most influenced human thought. The fact that aggressive Germany must prove to her own people that she did *not* begin this war, the very fact that she must write elaborate arguments to prove that ruthless methods are necessary or conducive to victory and *therefore* right and commendable (even when outwardly horrible and deplorable) proves that a higher spirit is in the world today than of old. If today the conscience of Germany as a whole can be appeased only by proof that their war is defensive, it is because the Sermon on the Mount, the Cross, the thirteenth chapter of Romans, have combined to make aggressive war appear as it never did before, to the human conscience everywhere, ungodly and inhuman. It is significant also that the vision of a world-wide league of nations, of universal standards of justice between nation and nation, of freedom for all peoples to direct their own internal affairs, is not cherished or advocated most convincingly and earnestly by those nations, whether autocratic or democratic, where the work of the Church has least effect on the governments, but in those regions where the authority of the Spirit of Christ is most openly and generally obeyed by those who mould opinion and direct the affairs of State.

9. The final question is whether this doctrine, that a citizen is under obligation to support the

State actively in its exercise of justice upon all criminals, including an invading army, does not annul the Christian witness and the great doctrine of love. Sometimes the position is explained by an appeal to what is called "the omnipotence of love." It is held that merely to go on loving, and to claim no right for the individual and the State to punish wrongdoing, will in the end win the whole world to right doing. It may seem very hard to speak of this as a mere chimera; but the argument almost forces this or a similar term upon the mind. The abstract phrase, "the omnipotence of love," like the abstract phrase, "might is right," or "war is a biological blessing," is open to all the dangers which haunt abstractions when they are applied with logical consistency to the concrete facts of human experience.

When we speak of love, we speak of the attitude of one rational soul to another. If we speak of the omnipotence of love, we mean that this attitude, when it is one of benevolence and self-sacrifice, has an inherent power completely to change the spirit and will of a hostile man. When brought in this way to the concrete, the phrase is less impressive, less convincing. When, for convenience' sake, we speak of the omnipotence of love, we may indeed acknowledge that there is a range of life where it is to be accepted as a great truth. The love of God is omnipotent intensively, inwardly, in

relation to the life, character, and destiny of the individual man who accepts it and sets himself to live in its light, drinking into his very soul its infinite power. All our hope of salvation depends on the omnipotence of the divine love in this sense and when it is, as Paul puts it, "shed abroad into our hearts." But it is nowhere affirmed in the Scriptures that love is omnipotent extensively. Not even of the love of God is it guaranteed that it will finally subdue every human will. Rather does the New Testament hold out the most solemn warnings that it is possible for even a finite will so to identify itself with evil as to lose the very power to appreciate, to receive, and to be saved by that love.

Further, the display of love extensively or universally, without discrimination or action concerning wrongdoing, is to condone sin. It is to establish crime and spread moral disorder. There is no range of human experience, where benevolence towards wrongdoing can be exercised apart from the infliction of punishment and the defense of right, without moral danger to all concerned. Every act of forgiveness, if it is to be of healthful result, must be exercised only towards the penitent, and no penitence is sincere which does not confess the justice of punishment, or which rebels against the law that exacts penalty.<sup>8</sup>

---

<sup>8</sup> "What pugnacity wants is to *make the man over*; it wants to create the conditions for the free self-rejection of the evil. And

An extension of this argument confronts us with the question whether it is possible for a man sincerely to support the State when it exercises force upon wrongdoers, and yet obey the far-reaching and glorious command of Jesus that we must love our enemies. It is obvious that love and pity are not impossible even when men punish criminals, any more than when parents punish children for the maintenance of right in the home. It is also obvious, and the history of the Church has gloriously illustrated it, that it is possible for Christian men to manifest love towards their persecutors even when these put them to torture and death. It is only in relation to the act of the State when it would punish an invading force by warfare that the question becomes most searching.

In the first place, it must be remembered that there are many instances in which Christian men have fought against an enemy and have borne witness, and proved it, that they cherish no hatred of the individual opposed to them. If he dropped wounded they immediately ran to his succor, and did all they could to alleviate his pain and to restore his life. The British soldier of whom an authentic story is told, who, having struck down his German opponent, immediately tried to ease his position

---

for this act of creation the absolute justice of 'Love your enemies' is a necessary demand." W. E. Hocking, "Human Nature and Its Remaking," p. 351.

and to share with him his own meager supply of water, and asked him whether he could do more for him, manifested the spirit of love. The act of his opponent was even more sublime, when he took from his pocket an English Testament, and in English said to the man who had struck him down, "I am dying. This book has been to me the water of life. I pray that it may be the same to you." This is not hatred, but it is war. It is not mere sentiment, yet it is love. It is the gleam that falls upon the murk of battle and the shame of war from the heart of the Eternal Father of both those men. The British officer who could not endure the sight of a German officer wounded and writhing on the wires, who leaped over the top, took the man from the wires, carried him across to the German trenches, and gave him to his friends, was acting in love. The German officer who took from his own breast the Iron Cross and pinned it on the breast of that English officer, was at least revealing his sense of admiration for the generous love of his enemy. In this very war, amid all that is sordid and hateful, amid all passion and revengefulness of spirit, thousands of such events have occurred which prove that obedience to the law of Jesus, strange and illogical as it may seem, baffling to the cold reason, is yet not only possible, but extensively actual on the field of battle itself.

People who believe that it adds to the efficiency

of the fighter to get him into the mood of passionate hatred, forget that hatred originally, as an animal instinct, was born of fear. When hatred fails of its purpose, it is fear which springs up as its active substitute. Drill sergeants who, as I have heard, shout at their men practicing the bayonet on dummy figures, "Hate him, hate him," are running a great risk. They are in danger of creating a loss of morale if their men suffer temporary defeat. Hate may fall back into its matrix, which is fear. On the other hand, those who think love cannot go into war forget that love is not pure love unless it has in it the capacity for moral indignation and that love itself withers unless the indignation is made effective. This is abundantly evident in private life, where no man would allow love to make him fellowship with works and workers of darkness. The same deep principle obtains in the world field and in national life. Love, which burns with moral indignation at the diabolical deeds of Germany, will lose its divine quality unless it find a powerful way of making its indignation effective. The only way that can be discovered is the crushing of German armies.

10. But the final test which Jesus gives for the love of our enemies is the will to pray for them. He is thinking of prayer in its most real, sincere, and energetic form. The man who can in the very depths of his heart pray to God for the supreme

blessing of his foe has conquered hate and fulfilled the law of love to the uttermost. Can we pray for Germany?

One who sincerely believes that this is not only possible, but obligatory for all Christian men in Christian lands, must be very careful to define the conditions of such prayer. It cannot be sincere if it be untrue to the situation. It cannot be earnest unless the situation and the meaning of the prayer are both clearly seen. In the first place, no one who believes that the German Government, and the people so far as they have shared the spirit and purpose of the Government, has committed a colossal crime against humanity can wish or pray for anything less than that the German army should be defeated. The German people must forever be compelled to resign their mad and wicked dream of universal dominion, of supremacy over the nations of the world. Moreover, if Germany is guilty, then it is a prerequisite for the moral order of the world that Germany should be punished by defeat. Sincere prayer for Germany must begin with that.

In the second place, if Germany is thus deeply guilty and unaware, if her statesmen and her armies have broken every law of honor and decency, as they have, it follows as day follows night that Germany can never come to her best, cannot receive the full divine blessing upon her national life, until she becomes aware of the moral repro-

bation of the world.<sup>9</sup> She must awake to see the guilt which rests upon her, which all the world sees resting upon her name, staining deep her record. No sincere prayer for Germany can stop short of an intense spiritual desire that that nation may become aware of the position in which her rulers have placed her before God's holy will and man's conscience. It is true that this view must be taken with the utmost humility by the Christian citizens of other lands. They know the moral iniquities which obtain among themselves, they know what wrongs their own governments have done in the past, what sins are spread broadcast among their own people, they know what mixture of motives has entered into the share which they take in this war. These things they will no less earnestly and seriously confess before God than the confession which they make of the sin of Germany. Nevertheless, as imperfect men everywhere have to deal with the holiest things, and to pass judgment on open crime and vice, so in this case. A sin more flagrant than that of any other government has been committed, a criminal will has been adopted or acquiesced in by a whole people, which has done greater wrong to the race than ever the world saw.

---

<sup>9</sup> "War is not to be understood as necessarily a negation of the principle of Christianity; a just war is an attempt to create the conditions under which the opponent is *disposed to listen* to the language of the still small voice." W. E. Hocking, "Human Nature and Its Remaking," p. 351.

Germany must herself see that, ere her own conscience can be cleansed and her future place in history as one of high honor and achievement can be recovered. For this the Christian man may pray.

And lastly, prayer for Germany will include an intense desire that the people of that Empire may in true penitence of national spirit resolve to cleanse themselves of this wrong, to change the very depths of their purpose, if necessary to overthrow their system of government, which has proved itself the destroyer of moral order. These acts must be taken openly, whether they come up through a spread of the principles of their Social Democracy, or through the establishment of a thoroughly representative and responsible government. They must include secured guarantees for a period of years that international obligations shall be observed. If these changes rest on a new will to peace, proved by cordial entrance into a league of nations for the enforcement of peace, they will be witness to the world of the penitence of a people. What lies beyond these outward acts in the inner soul of the nation, how various classes relate themselves to it, is all beyond the eyes of man. For us this will be taken as proof enough of a true penitence. Sorrow will accompany it, and humiliation, that is most certain; long the burden of these years and the years that prepared for them will rest upon the conscience and agon-

ize the heart of the best people in the Empire, as doubtless they do among many German Christians already. It is this that we may pray for. In doing so we are petitioning the Throne of Grace for the highest blessing which even God can confer upon our enemies of the German Empire.

This is to pray for Germany, and thus to pray is not only within the reach of every Christian man: it is one of the most solemn duties of his life.

II. In view of all that we have said regarding the State and the Church, certain very important questions arise which may be summarized in the following brief statement. How shall men act who, first, are in fellowship with Christ and seeking to manifest His spirit; and, second, are also under obligation to the State to maintain its true functions with sincerity and loyalty, when the State orders them to take part in its work of punishing evil-doers, whether these are of the criminal class among their own citizens, or of the criminals constituted by an invading army making an unjust war? In answer to this, the following statements may perhaps prove to be sufficient.

In the first place, the most obvious duty of the Christian man is so to live and teach and share in the life of the Christian community that the sins from which all crime and the gravest crime of all, namely an aggressive and robber war, arise, shall be rebuked. He must seek to use his influence as a

citizen to remove all conditions of thought and life, and all forms of social and industrial wrong, which produce their fruits in crime. This, as we have seen, is the true and national function of the Church, and in the exercise of that function every follower of Christ must exert his and her full personal influence.

The second, and equally obvious, duty of the Christian citizen is that he shall stand by the State, that he shall be prepared to support it and share in its divinely ordained task of maintaining the basic moral order on which the structure of civilized life is erected. The problem becomes acute in discussion with pacifists at this very point. Does a situation arise when the law that I shall stand by the State in the exercise of its true functions comes into conflict with my duty to obey Jesus Christ? Clearly such a case might arise if a man were ordered to do an injustice to a fellow citizen who is innocent of transgression. Such cases have occurred in abundance when the State, under erroneous views of its rights, persecuted its citizens for the holding of certain religious beliefs. Such an event is illustrated in the secular sphere by the action of those British officers who refused to fight against the Americans in the war of the Revolution. These men gave up their commissions, cut short their careers, rather than assist their government in the performance of an act which

they considered to be obviously unjust and unwise. But does such a case occur when the State orders the service of its citizens to put down actual and undeniable crime, to repel attacks upon the moral order and the very existence of the State? Most pacifists are quite clear about the matter when it is restricted to the work of the judge on the bench, the policeman on his beat; they object only when the work of the soldier is under consideration. I trust we have made it clear in the preceding argument that the work of the soldier in the only kind of war which a Christian can defend, namely a defensive war, is simply an extension of the work of the judge, the policeman, and the executors of justice. It is a case of completely broken logic, therefore, when one fails to see the essential identity at this point of the functions of the courts and of the Army; and of the obligation which they impose upon a loyal citizen.

As we have pointed out in an earlier chapter,<sup>10</sup> the function of the State is to exercise force, the function of the Church is to exercise the spirit of sacrifice. I venture to illustrate the operation of these two principles from the somewhat unusual experience of one man, my father, John Mackenzie of South Africa.

In the late seventies of the last century, John Mackenzie was working as a missionary at Kur-

---

<sup>10</sup> See above, p. 49.

uman in South Bechuanaland. A threatening movement arose over a large part of South Africa among the natives, who resolved to clear the white man out of those regions. They began by murdering isolated traders and farmers, and a large force marched on to Kuruman to kill the missionaries. A number of missionaries and traders took refuge in the strong buildings of the Moffat Institution, of which John Mackenzie was the head. The refugees pled with him to appeal to the British government in Cape Colony for assistance. He declined to do so, on the ground that when he became a missionary he took his life and the lives of his family in his hand, knowing the risk. He did this in the cause of the Gospel, whose law is sacrifice. To prove that it was not fear that guided his policy, or weakness of will, he walked out alone and unarmed, one day, into the camp of the native warriors; and discussed with them the wickedness of their actions, and the folly of their plans. In this way he fulfilled the meaning of non-resistance as Professor Hocking analyzes it when he says: "The forgiving, or non-resisting, or enemy-loving attitude has its entire justification in the 'new idea' which it conveys to the wrong-doer. It is a language; and the whole virtue of a language is that it is understood."<sup>11</sup> "*So sprach*"—the Spirit of Christ, not of Nietzsche. A few years later some

<sup>11</sup> W. E. Hocking, "Human Nature and Its Remaking," p. 352.

Transvaal Boers, contrary to a clear covenant, broke over their Western boundary, and began to harry the natives among whom the foundations of a Christian civilization had been laboriously laid by Moffat, Livingstone, Mackenzie, and their fellow-missionaries. The native farms were seized, their cattle driven off. They were threatened with oppression and serfdom. The British Government sent an expeditionary force of five thousand men under that good Christian and splendid administrator, the late Sir Charles Warren, as Special Commissioner. He asked John Mackenzie to go with him as Civil Commissioner to assist him in dealing with both the natives and the Boers. Without hesitation John Mackenzie accepted the task and Sir Charles Warren in his dispatches and reports bore witness to the invaluable work of the missionary.

In each of these cases John Mackenzie acted in the light of his singularly clear conscience. In the one as a representative of the Church he was ready for the extreme of sacrifice. In the other as a servant of his State he was ready to share in the use of force. The final aim of each course of conduct was the same, and in each that aim was measurably secured.

# ETHICAL VALUES IN THE WORLD WAR



## CHAPTER VI

### ETHICAL VALUES IN THE WORLD WAR

#### A. THE AIMS AND METHODS OF GERMANY

It is our duty now to see more closely how the principles which have been worked out in the preceding pages can be applied to the present situation.

No event so great as the World War can be due to causes that are merely local and occasional. Its sources must lie wide and deep in the history of Europe and the world. It is not our duty here to investigate all the origins of the catastrophe. We are concerned, for the purposes of this ethical discussion, with the very definite, narrow field presented by the position and purpose of Germany.

1. In the first place, it is written forever in history that Germany began the World War. It is in vain for her authorities to cast the blame now upon France, now upon Russia, now upon England, or upon all three combined, as if they had concerted to launch the bolt. It was Germany which began the war; and there are many Germans of first-rate importance who openly acknowledge the fact. Abundance of literature written before the

war, published broadcast in the German Empire, bore witness to the hardening will of the nation preparing for war. Works like those of von Bernhardi, of Tannenberg, von Claussewitz, and many others, reveal the energy with which the people were being instructed, organized, fired with enthusiasm for the supreme test of their power and consummation of their ambition.

No doubt it is unjust to place the full responsibility upon any one man, even the Kaiser, when we consider the last steps and the last fatal act. No one man could hurl an empire into such a struggle unless he represented the mind of at least a large part of the population, the will of their principal leaders; unless his act had been prepared for through many years of history and seemed justified to the great majority by their experience and the position of their nation in the midst of others. It is true that when Prussia put herself at the head of the German Empire she found herself in course of time ringed round with powerful nations which might prove hostile to her if occasion for hostility arose. It is true also that the Balkan wars had opened a new day in the history of the Slavic world, and that the silent, constant, irresistible movement of Slavic life westward across Europe was, and is, destined profoundly to transform the life of the older nations of the continent. Their invasion of Germany was much deeper than we

realize. It is true also, as we have said before, that some sympathy may be felt for the German mind when it discovered that the subjects of the Kaiser who forsook the Fatherland did not go to their own colonies in Africa, but to settle under other civilized governments in North and South America and elsewhere. Germany felt herself, therefore, hemmed in on a territory becoming increasingly inadequate and unable to gain new regions eligible for colonization without overthrowing and annexing territories already under the sway of other States.

It was this situation which opened the eyes of the Kaiser nearly twenty-five years ago to the fact that what Germany required, in order to become in the largest sense of the word a world power, was a navy strong enough to compete successfully with the most powerful navy in the world—this, on the theory that two powerful navies cannot exist in the world at the same time and fulfil their functions each for its own country without coming to war with one another. Hence her claim that “the freedom of the seas” did not exist so long as the major part of the seas was guarded by the navy of the British Empire. The fact that this navy never interfered with the course of commerce, that the harbors of that Empire were all open on equal terms to all the nations of the world, as well as to the ships of the British dominions, was

not a fact that conveyed any meaning to the German mind. Freedom was not freedom unless it meant dominion; and if even in name or ultimate resources the British navy held dominion, no other navy in the German sense had freedom. Therefore the only way for Germany to secure freedom of the seas was to secure dominion for herself. There is no other conceivable sense in which the German cry for freedom of the seas can be understood.

The Kaiser by his naval policy prepared long years before the event for the great war of conquest. No doubt he began his reign by proclaiming himself a "prince of peace," partly to allay the nervous fears of his own people, who were not yet educated to grasp those ideals which early stirred in his restless and ambitious mind. But he used with supreme skill the very work of preparation as the means for carrying on that education. As his power grew, he tested and enjoyed the taste of it. He found that other nations were increasingly overawed by the magnitude of his military and naval achievements. Time after time France and Great Britain, Russia and Italy, were confronted with challenges before which they seemed to quail. And each diplomatic victory, which was always secured by a rattle of the scabbard, made his confidence grow. It was the Moroccan affair which proved to him that the limit of patience was being

reached, and that the day must come when his gage of battle would be taken up by one or more of his rivals. This hastened and intensified the process of preparation. The people were blinded and excited by the means which were used to increase the army and navy. Fabulous and glittering prospects were held before their eyes. Pride in their power, scorn of all other peoples, were sedulously cultivated by every means which skilful rulers could devise. Then when the propitious hour seemed to have struck, the famous and infamous Council of German and Austrian rulers and leaders was held at Potsdam, July 5, 1914, to arrange for the assault on Europe.

It is not we, non-Germans, who hurl an unjust accusation against an innocent and beleaguered race. Many of their own most important men have with pride confessed the diabolical crime, its preparation, its purpose, its origin in their own souls. The words of that stormy petrel, but true and loyal German, Maximilian Harden, are enough. In his newspaper, *Die Zukunft*, where so much truth, even unpalatable to his own Government, has been flashed on the world, Harden wrote on August 1, 1914:

“Let us drop our miserable attempts to excuse Germany’s action. Not against our will and as a nation taken by surprise did we hurl ourselves into this gigantic venture. We willed it; we had to

will it. We do not stand before the judgment seat of Europe; we acknowledge no such jurisdiction. Our might shall create a new law in Europe; it is Germany that strikes."

But for that act Germany does stand now and forever before the judgment seat of humanity and of the living God.

2. Secondly, Germany began this war with a policy, partly announced officially, partly discussed and accepted by the people as a whole, partly revealed only by the course of events and the steady development of plans since the war began. It is known now through one or all of these sources of information that Germany had set her mind and still maintains her purpose as to the following points: She desired to control the life of Belgium; probably she had been determined to possess the industrial portion of northern France and some, at any rate, of the Channel ports. The attainment of these desires would mean the easy, progressive absorption of Holland, perhaps without a war. It is now known that her intention was, and is, to seize parts of Russia, that she might balance her industrial gains on the West by enlarging the field of agricultural opportunity for her people to the East. The rapid development of her alliances with Austria, Bulgaria, and Turkey made not merely possible but actual that imperial sway from Hamburg to Bagdad which has come

to be recognized as one of her supreme ambitions, and one full of menace for the rest of the world.<sup>1</sup>

It is believed, and the proof is practically complete, that Germany desired not merely territorial aggrandizement, but a reconstruction of imperial finances. The costly growth of her armies and navy had put a burden upon the people which threatened to bring about a disturbance of credit. While she boasted that she had achieved her aims without imposing a crushing load of taxation, it must be remembered that a system of loans had been created which merely postponed the fall of the burden upon the nation. Only one method of deliverance was possible, and that was by the exaction of enormous indemnities in gold from conquered nations. How far this motive was felt as a driving force, we may not here attempt to say. It seems, however, to be completely proved that it must be counted as one of those circumstances which urged the Government onwards to her momentous act.

3. In the third place, we must take account once more of the long and thorough course of preparation which was made for the supreme hour.

---

<sup>1</sup> Acknowledgment should be made by all thoughtful people of the extremely important service of André Chéradame in his publications, which are the chief literary authority on the subject here referred to: "The Pan-German Plot Unmasked," "Pan-Germania, the Disease and Cure," "The United States and Pan-Germania."

As it approached, the possession of almost immeasurable military force brought world dominion within view, and then threw into relief as the only alternative to complete national success a national downfall. Nowhere has this been more clearly expressed than in von Bernhardt's famous chapter, "World Dominion or Downfall" (*Weltmacht oder Niedergang*). Perhaps the climax of all her preparations is to be found in the German military law which was passed on June 30, 1913. This law provided for an addition of 136,000 officers and men to her army, and especially provided for an expenditure of a large part of the new taxation in the provision of war material. To meet this expenditure an impost was made upon the capital of German subjects, and they were induced to make the sacrifice by a special appeal to their patriotism in an hour of special difficulty for the Fatherland. Manifestly the hour was approaching for some great act. Dr. Gottfried Nippold is quoted as having said in that very year that "systematic stimulation of the war spirit is going on," and he accuses his Government of deliberately carrying on "the systematic cultivation of a war-like spirit." There were those who maintained that the passage of the law to which I have referred was simply the beginning of mobilization, and that throws light upon the fact, of which Germans boast so much, that they mobilized

forces beyond the calculation of all other military powers with a rapidity which looked like a miracle. It is one of themselves who has said, "When we saw all this, we were not astonished, because it was no miracle; it was nothing other than the net result of a thousand years of work and preparation, it was the natural product of the whole of human history."<sup>2</sup> The rhetoric here may be forgiven. The fact is, forty years is enough to account for the apparent miracle, or even twenty. For it seems to have been only towards the end of last century that the rulers of Germany began to form deliberate plans for the achievement of the victory which this war was intended to obtain.

Among the means adopted to make a German victory secure we are compelled to place the policy which that Empire pursued in relation to the Hague Conventions. These great international conventions, which awoke the admiration of thoughtful people throughout the world, seemed to open a new day to human history. Perhaps they did. But in the meantime the promise is delayed or the dawn made hideous. Or is this war the deep darkness that precedes the dawn? At these conventions it was felt from the first that the German representatives were an alien force. They set

---

<sup>2</sup> Quoted in "Conquest and Kultur, Aims of the Germans in Their Own Words," issued by the Committee on Public Information, Washington, D. C.

themselves in opposition to all the main provisions which seemed to make for what we may call the moralizing of war. But they set themselves in most determined and successful opposition towards all efforts at establishing compulsory arbitration and a process of compulsory disarmament among all the nations of the world. Indeed, in relation to the last matter it was recently stated by a cabinet member in the British House of Commons, that when reduction of armaments was beginning to be discussed at the last Hague Convention the German Government informed Great Britain that if she pressed that subject upon the Convention it would be considered a *casus belli*!

4. In the fourth place, it is necessary to consider the methods of war which have been deliberately adopted and carried out by Germany.

It has already been pointed out that the German mind is nothing if not thoroughly logical, and that it is willing to take all the consequences in the application of its process of logical reasoning to the process of active life.

Starting out then with the conception of war as a necessary, healthful, and constant function of the State, with the belief that every nation has the right to develop its own life even at the cost of others,<sup>3</sup> Germany has pursued to the bitter end for herself and others every deduction which

---

<sup>3</sup> Discussed above, Chapter IV, *passim*.

seems to be legitimately made from those fundamental principles:

a. In the first place, a State that is wisely guided in modern times will make long, thorough preparation for war. It will try to foresee the directions in which war is likely to arise, the enemies it may have to deal with, the gains which it must strive to secure, the significance of these for its own history and its further relations with the rest of the world. In pursuance of this policy of complete preparation, Germany not only built up the most mighty military system the world has ever seen, but made her preparation in all parts of the world for the world crisis which she not only foresaw, but expected herself to create. Among the rights of government is that of becoming acquainted with the conditions of life, the military resources, and the foreign policy of other lands. All governments seek this information more or less exhaustively, but all other governments of the world have imposed upon themselves certain restrictions which we may bluntly call restrictions of decency. They have realized that there must be a limit to the thoroughness, the completeness, with which this work is carried on, and a very definite limit to the methods which are employed. Such limitations Germany has scorned to regard. Logical consistency dictates unlimited completeness of work in every direction, and therefore in this. Therefore Germany has not

scrupled to create a system of espionage and to enter upon secret policies of influencing public opinion in other lands, which no other government would conceive of undertaking. The result has been, as the world has discovered since 1914 to its astonishment and indignation, that Germany has carried out systematic treachery in practically all her dealings with every country. The Prussian ascribes this procedure to energy of will, our failure in it to laxity of will. We ascribe avoidance of it to our moral self-respect.

The system is as follows: Every German subject is a servant of the Kaiser—wherever he goes he is at the call of his master. If, therefore, a merchant is traveling in China, a professor of science attends a meeting of a learned society in Paris or Australia, a pious missionary is working in India or Africa—they are all understood to be at the service of their country. They have often received instructions to send to Berlin ethnological and geographical studies of the countries they visited or lived in, with the result that important data were gathered by the military authorities in Berlin concerning those regions which would be of great value to an invading army. In pursuance of this policy the German Government has used even its colonies in Africa, by the building of railways, the making of forts, the storing up of military resources, as bases for future warfare against neighboring terri-

tories. The exposures of the work done by her embassy in the United States and the Argentine, in Mexico and Japan, since 1914 have revealed the depths to which even her highest ambassadors and diplomats would descend in the carrying out of this terrible policy. Everywhere they have used every means conceivable, however shameful, to gain information, and everywhere they have used every means conceivable, however shameful, to undermine the authority of governments among their own people, to entangle them in their relations with other countries, and thus to win advantage to the German Empire.

b. A German doctrine of war which has startled the world since it has been proved to be not merely the theory of scholars, but the living policy of the German Government, consists in this—that war is not a war between armies, but between nations. The object of each is not merely to beat the enemy, but to conquer the people of the other land. In fact, even though there were a sincere desire only to fight with armed men, account must be taken of the fact that armed enemies defending their own territories are immediately and constantly supported and strengthened by the sympathy and loyalty of their civilian fellow-citizens. It is obvious, then, that an invading army must realize the whole population as constituting its object of attack. Since the one aim of warfare is victory

as complete as possible, victory as swiftly as possible, and therefore victory at least cost to the invader and at greatest cost to the nation invaded, no act should be neglected which will secure that end. This doctrine is the logical fountainhead of those methods of warfare which have been constantly and systematically carried out by Germany in Belgium, France, Serbia, Rumania, and Russia. There is no difference in her methods in all these lands. Everywhere she has treated the civilian population as active enemies. Everywhere she has used them without scruple for her own military advantage. There is no need here to recite the details or proofs which abound concerning the theory, and the unflinching method in which war thus conceived has been carried on.<sup>4</sup> The following actions are abundantly established by unquestionable witnesses: Early in the war certain German officers put Belgian women and children in front of their advancing regiments to face the fire of French and Belgian forces. Women and children have been constantly employed in war work against their own country, and this often within the fire zone of the battle-field. Men, women and children

---

<sup>4</sup> The report of the Bryce Commission, the report of a judicial inquiry by Belgian officials and judges, the diaries of German soldiers, the witness of newspaper correspondents and of the American Belgian Relief Commission, are all sources to which any reader may turn easily for full information on this ghastly subject. The United States Government through its Committee on Public Information has issued two Reports on German War Practices.

have been executed without trial in large numbers on various pleas, all unproved and all out of relation to the terrible penalty exacted. Women and children have been driven homeless and starving out of their homes, in order that German soldiers might occupy these and eat the produce of their farms and gardens. "War is not itself unchristian, when it is not, as regards its purpose, an offensive one. The State has to guard its honor, that is, its sovereignty; and when this is assailed, it is its duty to make use of every material means, and therefore of war also, to repel such assault—an imposing example of self-defence. But its aim is not to destroy the enemy, not to strike to the heart, but to attain to an honorable peace."<sup>5</sup> Shades of Belgium and Serbia, this was written in Berlin!

In all invaded lands German officers and men have been allowed systematically to pillage practically every village, city, or lonely farmhouse, or chateau which they entered. Where furniture could not be carried off, it has been smashed; where machinery was valuable, it has been taken away to Germany; where money has been found, it has been stolen. All this has been done contrary to the modern laws of war to which Germany put her own name publicly and solemnly in the Hague Convention. The destruction of cities and churches has been carried out systematically with-

---

<sup>5</sup> Dorner, "Christian Ethics." Trans., p. 580.

out military reason. Cathedrals have been shelled down on the plea that they were used as outlook posts by the French and British, in spite of the repeated and solemn denial of the latter that they had ever been so used. And indeed in those days, when Rheims Cathedral was in the center of a zone where many observation balloons and airplanes were constantly higher in the air than any town, there could be no good reason for any French officer endangering the cathedral by attempting to use a spot so low down as that for observation purposes. When the Germans retired over a wide territory after the battle of the Somme in 1916, they devastated the country thoroughly, cutting down even fruit trees, a proceeding denounced as barbarous by Oriental warriors in ancient times. Germany, in pursuit of logical thoroughness, and seeking to subdue not an army but the spirit of a people, raided open towns and villages in England and France with bombs dropped from airplanes. Large multitudes of civilians of all ages and both sexes have been killed in this way. Germany has sunk merchant ships without observation of the recognized principles of international law. Many thousands of civilians have been drowned. Germany has sunk hospital ships, has now begun almost systematically to bomb Red Cross hospitals in France. Finding that the Young Men's Christian Association, by its superb service, helps to

sustain the spirit of an army, Germany now makes Y M C A huts in France a special object of attack by shells from her guns and her airplanes.

The sickening indictment might be carried much further, for there is literally no act which could injure a country and so seem to hasten the victory of the invaders from which the German commanders would shrink.

c. We must take account of the revival by the Germans of that ancient system of deportation which has not been thoroughly carried out by any other race since the days of the Assyrians. It is a clear and simple deduction from the original principles which have been laid down, that if a State with an overflowing population intends to conquer and occupy neighboring territories, it must secure in some way the removal of the inhabitants. This procedure has been carried out by Germany since 1914 in three or four different ways. In Belgium she has done it by murder of many thousands of the people, by creating conditions of starvation which decrease the population, by carrying off large numbers to work in Germany, where, insufficiently fed and sufficiently ill-treated, they have died by the thousand. In the Orient another method has been employed. Turkey has been engaged to clear out the glorious regions of Armenia, that German colonists might settle there in the great day when the Empire stretches to Bagdad.

How its work has been carried out under Germany's direction and by Germany's approval is known to all the world. In Serbia depopulation meant simply massacre, or expulsion from their territory, of practically the entire population by Germans and Austrians. In Russia, in the new Northern territories wrested from the Bolsheviki, the process goes on no less certainly than elsewhere. Eye-witnesses from America have told of seeing corpses of the Polish dead, men, women, and children, by hundreds of thousands strewn along the highways. For miles they traveled in a lane of human bodies. A young German officer, who for a time served in Galicia when Germany drove back the Russian armies that had conquered and occupied that territory, writes with astonishment of the fact that everywhere the Russian armies had paid respect to the persons and property of the inhabitants. He recorded in his diary that nothing was destroyed and the people were content. But he goes on to describe with almost naïve frankness the thoroughness with which his own fellow-officers and men proceeded to correct the mistake which the Russians had made. Where the Russian armies left order, property, self-respect in the people, the German armies, which were supposed to be delivering the territory from a foreign foe, left only devastation, poverty, and shame amongst the same people.

It is needless to cite specimens of the literature by which this very process of evacuating conquered territories has been expounded and defended. It is always open to say that any one utterance is the private opinion of the man who made the speech or wrote the book. But when you have many speeches and many books from many men, and even from governmental leaders of thought and public policy, and when you find that the actual practice of war fulfils the warnings of these speakers and writers, the conclusions are obvious, and they are damning. Thus Friedrich Lange so long ago as 1904: "If we take, we must also keep. A foreign territory is not incorporated until the day when the rights of property of Germans are rooted in its soil. With all necessary prudence, but also with inflexible determination, a process of expropriation should be inaugurated, by which the Poles and the Alsatians and Lorrainers would be gradually transported to the interior of the Empire, while Germans would replace them on the frontiers." Daniel Frymann, in a work which by the year 1914 had passed through twenty-one editions and therefore had been accepted as significant if not authoritative by multitudes of German people of all classes, wrote as follows: "But if we consider seriously the peculiar position of the German people, squeezed into the middle of Europe, and running the risk of being suffocated for want of

air, it must be agreed that we might be compelled to demand from a vanquished enemy, either in the East or in the West, that he should hand over the unpopulated territory. . . . (In case of war with Russia) We shall demand the cession of such territory as we need for the straightening of our frontiers and for colonization. Evacuation of it will be required." Some of these German brains write on this subject as if they had actually lost their balance, as when Klaus Wagner in his book entitled "*Krieg*" (War) writes as follows: "By right of war the right of strange races to migrate into Germanic settlements will be taken away. By right of war the non-Germanic (population) in America and Great Australia must be settled in Africa. . . . By right of war we can send back the useless South American Romance peoples and the half-breeds to North Africa." The extreme folly of such language must not blind us to the ghastly significance of the fact that men who seem otherwise to fulfil the requirements of a rational life, when they come to think and speak of the German Empire lose all sense of proportion, all sense of human decency. In the name of their honor they have lost the respect of the world, in the name of consistency they have blasted their reputation for humanity.<sup>6</sup>

<sup>6</sup> For the above quotations I am indebted to the document issued by the Committee on Public Information entitled "Conquest and Kultur, Aims of the Germans in Their Own Words."

5. The German Government long ago committed itself to the definite doctrine that treaties were to be observed only at the convenience of the stronger power. The world did not take this seriously and continued to enter into covenants with the Imperial Government. This will never again be possible. Two acts of the German autocracy are sufficient to expel her as an autocracy forever from the world of covenanted nations. When she invaded Belgium she trampled upon a sacred treaty. She confessed through the mouth of her chancellor and of her foreign secretary that this deed was wrong, but she pleaded military necessity as not merely her excuse but her justification. Whatever war needs, that must be done without regard to any other standards, even though they be the standards of truth before God and the world. There is no need to labor this point, which must be referred to again in a later chapter. Sufficient to say that, as if she had not thus convinced the world of her superiority to the laws of faithfulness, Germany proceeded three years later to make a treaty with the so-called Russian Government of the hour, and ere the ink was dry proceeded to trample her signature in the dust. The world can never forget the treachery of those who signed a treaty of peace at Brest-Litovsk, February, 1918, and since that date have progressively broken every one of its conditions and obligations, and

have used it merely as an instrument for absorbing vast and rich territories under the sway of the German sword, that the development and enlargement of the German people might proceed.

6. The conclusion of the matter is not merely that Germany is powerful, or that the German Government is wicked, but that this powerful Empire has deliberately adopted a policy which she defends with intellectual as well as physical methods, a policy which renders her superior to all treaties, superior to all dictates of humanity, superior to all the traditional laws of morality. This constitutes the Empire a menace to the world. The very meaning of humanity is in dispute; the purposes which the race is to pursue, the moral ideals which the nations must cherish, are in dispute; the fundamental principles of human character, not to speak of the revelations of the divine will concerning righteousness and justice, are in dispute. The principles which the whole world acknowledges are denied by Germany, and Germany does not merely deny them, but makes herself the most powerfully armed force in the history of men to put an end to those principles and to make effective, wherever her domination and influence go, those principles which we have described above, and which her conduct of the war, from the invasion of Belgium to the murder

of Red Cross nurses the other day, illustrates perfectly in practice.

7. There has been much discussion by intellectual Christian folk of the question whether or not it is just and wise to speak of Germany as a whole, when we pass a judgment of condemnation on the acts of her Government. The point is of ethical and practical importance.

On the one side we must remember that in so large a mass of people, many of them highly intelligent, many of them persons of a "good conscience," there must be centers of difference on all matters concerning national policy. In some parts of Germany there always have been a dislike and distrust of the Prussian spirit and the Prussian person, and a constant resentment against assimilation of the whole country to the moral type of the predominant partner in the Empire. There are three groups of considerable number and influence where there is today an inner and powerful, and not always silent, rebellion against the plans and spirit and methods of the Pan-Germanist party which has led the Empire into and in this war.

There are the Social Democrats, many of whom are true to their faith; a large number of intellectuals, some of whom have left the country, many of whom have remained in silent grief; and an indefinite but considerable section of the religious people, whose pastors have not misled them and

whose hearts are in anguish, torn between the fear of defeat and hatred of the leadership which has produced the war. It is in these circles that the hope of a morally regenerated German government and national policy lies.

It is wise and powerfully helpful that President Wilson should distinguish between the German people and their Government. Even though at present the better part is small, and the larger part of the nation deluded, the day approaches when the Government must face an awakened and indignant people. That the President of the United States should speak as if that day had come is one way of bringing it to pass.

But, on the other hand, we must consider the fact that a nation acts as a whole. Protesting minorities do not and cannot abolish the fact that the majority constitutes for the time being the will of the nation. There is no doubt that the vast majority of Germans welcomed the war without apprehension and with joyous foretaste of victory. The wiser and undeluded minority had no voice. Hence the necessity is upon us, even when we remember these silent circles who hold to the better part, to speak of the guilt of Germany as a whole. It is the German State that began the war, and the German nation must endure all the ignominy and the woe that will come with peace.

# **ETHICAL VALUES IN THE WORLD WAR**



## CHAPTER VII

### ETHICAL VALUES IN THE WORLD WAR

#### B. THE AIMS AND SPIRIT OF THE ALLIES AND OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

We must now consider the ethical values involved in the action of the Allied Powers and of the United States of America when they entered into the great war.

1. We must state the matter as simply and bluntly as possible in relation, say, to the United States. "Was it the duty of the American nation, acting through its Government, to enter into the war against Germany?"

Let us be careful to see what the wrong ways of putting this question may be. The question is not, "Are you angry enough to strike back?" nor, "Do you hate Germany hard enough to wish to kill the Germans?" Nor again, is it a relevant question whether America is herself sinless enough to engage in such a task. Some would say it is hypocrisy for a nation which has its own faults, to blame and chastise another, as this nation blames Germany and seeks to bring her to her knees. We

must remember that a man who sees before him a definite duty is not absolved from performing it because he is conscious of faults of his own. Shirking the duty imposed upon him by his office and relations to other people will never help to cleanse his conscience. Indeed, the hypocrisy may rather lie on the other side, on the side of a nation which should avoid the performance of its duty in war by professing to be morally unfitted for the task. These considerations are all aside from the real question, which is exactly as we have stated it above. Assuming that no man is without sin, no nation without its faults, its blunders, perhaps even its crimes, the question remains facing us, whether or not it is the duty of the United States of America as a nation and government to cast itself with all its strength into the task of defeating Germany, and so help to direct history away from the path on which German doctrine and the German spirit would drive the nations of the world.

There is still another way of putting the matter which we must deprecate. There are those who say, from the security of their Christian life, that this is a wicked world and that in such a world nothing else could be expected. This means that perhaps from mere earthly standpoints the declaration of war can be defended and those who live on these lower levels may not be adding therefore to their guilt before God by accepting their share

in the matter. This seems a clear case of intellectual prevarication. Our whole life and all our duties arise in a world of sin. All fulfilment of duty is infected with the imperfection of our personal characters, and all our attempts to obey the Sermon on the Mount are met by the perplexities of our situation. These principles, serene as the stars when Jesus speaks them, become confusing lights among the shadows of our earthly and our sinful relations and impulses. There is no region where Christian duty does not come upon us in the midst of relations which are not perfect, human laws which are defective, situations which have evil in them. It is into these that the will of God must enter and can enter only through our fulfilment of duty. Is it a religious duty to engage in the war?

2. Manifestly the Church of Christ in America could only maintain that this Government did wrong in declaring a state of war with Germany, on the theory that the existence of the State and the fulfilment of its functions lie outside the will of God, a position which, as we have seen, is inconsistent with the whole conception of human nature and the relation of the providence of God to human history, and with the place and task of the Church in the midst of the nations. In seeking, therefore, to discover whether the action of the State must receive the approval of Christian men and their support, we must briefly review the

action of the nations that are at war with Germany. What, on the whole, is the spirit in which they have undertaken this tremendous enterprise?

First, we must emphasize their unpreparedness and weakness up to the hour when the cataclysm occurred. These very conditions were confessedly part of the incitement felt by the German people. France was understood to be undermined in her morale, and inefficient in her military organization; Russia was understood to be very rapidly reforming her army institution and building up great military power, but this process was far from complete; Great Britain had indeed the most powerful navy in the world, but if she entered into the war, her efforts would be confined to the sea, as she had only a small standing army, large numbers of which were constantly necessary for garrisoning far-distant parts of her empire.

Next, we must remind ourselves of the most strenuous efforts made by each and all of these countries to prevent Germany from plunging Europe into a struggle that might end in the utter destruction of her civilization. It is no exaggeration to say that the ambassadors of all these nations at Berlin, and their cabinets in their own capitals, in almost hourly conference with German ambassadors and ministers, exhausted all the means which the human mind could conceive to change the purpose of the Kaiser and his ministry. Moral

suasion was carried to the utmost verge of self-respect. Appeals to the honor of Germany were urged with passion and conviction. Serbia agreed to the Austrian note except on one or two points, which she begged that Empire to refer to a neutral conference. Through her skilled and competent minister at Berlin, Belgium used all the resources of reason, all the appeals of heart and conscience, upon the chancellor and the foreign secretary of the Imperial Government.<sup>1</sup> France employed her ancient diplomatic skill and energy; Russia, all the resources at her command, to secure the same end.

As to the action of Great Britain, it is only necessary to quote the final judgment of the one German who of all others will stand in history as the supreme judge of the matter at this point. Prince Lichnowsky, in his Memorandum entitled, "My Mission to London, 1912-14," after describing the history of the negotiations which he carried on with Sir Edward Grey, declares that the mission was wrecked "not by the wiles of the British, but by the wiles of our policy," and again he says, "It is no wonder that the whole of the civilized world outside Germany placed the entire responsibility for the World War upon our shoulders." His account of his negotiations with the British Govern-

---

<sup>1</sup> The work of Baron de Beyens, "*L'Allemagne avant la Guerre*" (translated as "Germany before the War"), is surely one of the most illuminating, moving, and conclusive of all the many authoritative documents describing the origins of the war.

ment reveals the fact that to the very end that Government sought by every means to hold back the hand of Germany from its fatal blow. The decisive hour in British history was not reached until Belgium was invaded. Until that event took place, a large section of the British public and an important section of the British cabinet were not convinced that it would be necessary for Great Britain to enter the war. It is quite certain that she would have done so in any case; but the invasion of Belgium, carried out with extreme cynicism in defiance of treaty obligations, precipitated the conflicting opinions and impulses of the national life. Every honorable man decided that Great Britain had no alternative. Immediately all parts of the Empire sprang to arms, convinced that the motherland was right, determined to prove their conviction by assuming their full share in the unmeasured labor which now lay before them. It is useless, and indeed inept, to recall the fact that other interests of a more material kind must be served in the case of all these countries, when they win victory upon the fields of battle and Germany is on her knees. Whatever political benefits may accrue, nothing can ever change the fact that each and all of these nations drew the sword in defence of honor, in defence of freedom, in defence of right and justice against a force that trampled on all these, the highest treasures of the human national

spirit. Moreover, there is no earthly reward which can possibly be proposed to any of these nations which will weigh even as dust in the balance against the losses, the agonies, the crushing burden which they have endured through the years of war. They have paid and are paying a price beyond calculation, whose ultimate statement must be in terms of the soul, and its supreme sorrows.

3. From the beginning of the war the eyes of all nations were directed towards the United States of America. Her enormous resources made it certain that her successive decisions of policy would profoundly influence, perhaps finally determine, the fortunes of the war. During the first period President Wilson, as the leader of the policy of the government and the interpreter of the spirit of the people, issued a long series of notes, addressed now to Germany and now to the Allies. In these successive notes the President sought to make clear three different subjects:

First, he sought to expound the attitude of America towards the general situation and the defence of her proceedings when these were called in question by either side.†

Second, he tried as the head of a neutral government to discover ways in which peace might be secured by inducing both sides to define their aims and at least the preliminary conditions on which peace might be restored.

Third, he was later compelled to deal in a very special manner with the German breach of international law at sea. Her submarine warfare became ruthless. She attacked and sank merchant ships contrary to the rules of international law, under the plea that the submarine by its very nature could not do its work and observe the prescriptions of that law. With this excuse American citizens were drowned and American ships were directly attacked. On one occasion submarines sank ships off the American coast. The President's notes were intended to convince Germany that this procedure was wrong in itself, was practically an attack upon the United States of America, and therefore ought to be abandoned. For a brief time in April, 1916, it seemed as if his method had triumphed; but subsequent experience showed that the German Government had no intention of abandoning her claim of right in this matter. Through the winter of 1916-17, especially when she announced that an unlimited warfare would be carried on against all ships sailing within certain zones, the world saw that a crisis was being reached.

In the meantime the United States Government discovered that an appalling amount of treachery had been carried on within its own territories by German emissaries. This system was traced even to the German embassy at Washington. Men who were trusted as official representatives of the Ger-

man Government were found to have been engaged in conspiracies to attack Canada and to destroy factories and shipping in America. The disclosure of the famous Zimmermann letter to a German official in Mexico, in which it was proposed that Mexico and Japan should combine against the United States, brought matters to a crisis.

The world was astonished and often impatient at the long-drawn-out controversy which the President carried on with the German Government. He resisted every appeal to declare war in hours of passion, in a spirit of revenge. In his address to Congress on April 2, 1917, looking back over this period of history, he speaks of "all these bitter months through which America had endured the policy and hostile action of the present German Government." It was evident to all who understood the situation that President Wilson had exercised an almost unparalleled self-repression in carrying out what he considered to be the true policy of the Government of the United States. No one ever confronted a threatening foe with more patience. No one ever tried to divert him from acts of hostility more sincerely. No one ever allowed himself and the people over whom he ruled to endure more of what the world calls humiliation, in the endeavor to maintain that self-respect which only he can deeply feel who feels that when at last he begins to fight, the compulsion has come

from without. "Too proud to fight" is a famous phrase which was hurled back at the President with contempt and scorn by eloquent lips; but people forget that it was matched by the correlative phrase which was uttered at a later date, when he said that times came when a man must be "too proud not to fight." Only in the combination of the elements of these two ethical ideals can the true law of life be found. The American treatment of Mexico is the triumphant fulfilment of the former, the American armies in France are the result of the latter principle.

It became increasingly clear to the whole American people, not merely that Germany had already made war upon the Republic when it attacked her innocent citizens going about their rightful business and upon her ships on the open sea, but that Germany must include an attack upon America at some date yet to come in her program of world conquest. Mr. Gerard in his book, "My Four Years in Germany," bears witness to the fact that the Kaiser himself twice uttered the threat that after the war Germany would reckon with America. What confronted the nation, therefore, was not merely a present wrong, but a future attack. The great war ceased to be merely a European affair. Already it had involved Japan, India, and the British dominions, already it had invaded Africa. It was quite clear now that the republics

of North and South America were involved. Especially was the Republic of the United States of America at last compelled to decide whether she could longer maintain her position as a State committed to the task of maintaining order and right within her own life without entering upon the great contest.

4. It was on April 2, 1917, after some months of increasing anxiety for the American nation, that the President made his momentous address to Congress. In this address he pointed out that Germany was now engaged in "a war against all nations." "The challenge," he said, "is to all mankind." He made it clear that in respect of the United States the duty of Congress was not to initiate war, but to recognize the fact that Germany had actually begun war against the American people. "I advise that the Congress declare the recent course of the Imperial Government to be in fact nothing less than war against the Government and people of the United States; that it formally accept the status of belligerent which has thus been thrust upon it." Far beyond the immediate pressure of the hour, he saw the goal towards which America must move in the conduct of this war. "Let us be very clear," he said, "and make very clear to all the world, what our motives and our objects are. . . . Our object . . . is to vindicate the principles of peace and justice in the life of the

world as against selfish and autocratic power, and to set up among the really free and self-governing peoples of the world such a concert of purpose and of action as will henceforth ensure the observance of those principles." The most famous utterance in this momentous document, the one by which it will be known in history, is this: "The world must be made safe for democracy"; but the really most important statement of policy in the whole message is contained in an earlier paragraph, where after describing the ideal for which America and the Allies must fight, which we have quoted above, he says, "A steadfast concert for peace can never be maintained except by a partnership of the democratic nations. No autocratic government could be trusted to keep faith within it or observe its covenants." These are words from which the opponents of the German Empire can never resile without loss of honor and disaster to the human race. They are the central statement in the address, the essential meaning of the war.

5. We come now to answer the question for which the material is laid before us by the entire argument of the preceding chapters. The question from the point of view of Christian Ethics has already been put point-blank in the very simple words, "Was it the duty of America to enter into this war?" If we answer, "Yes," we must take all the consequences upon our shoulders. Our whole

argument has aimed at establishing the fact that behind this question there lies another: "Is it necessary for America to use force against the force of another country in order to fulfil her own functions and preserve her own existence as a State and nation?" For as we have so fully argued, if the State is a natural and divine institution, if its functions are sacred functions, then, in the largest sense, they must be looked upon as essentially Christian functions.

In view of the whole situation, the conclusion of a student of Christian Ethics must be as follows: First, the fundamental function of maintaining a moral order wherever her authority and the life and sacred rights of her citizens extend must be exercised against the attacks, present and to come, of the German Empire. This duty could not be avoided without the surrender of the life of the State.

Second, the burden of this duty involves the moral necessity of supporting and assisting those sister nations which are in danger of being destroyed by the same enemy that seeks the destruction of the State and nation of America. From the beginning of the war many American citizens maintained that the Government ought at once to have ranged itself on the side of stricken and murdered Belgium. The country as a whole was not convinced. But it has added enormously to

the sense of high moral obligation, and even of religious devotion, that America now finds herself in active defence not only of her own rights, but of those of Belgium and France, which have been so ruthlessly trampled under an iron heel.

Third, it is a moral obligation that all nations in the world which are organized for the establishment of freedom and justice and the promotion of moral and peaceful relations among the peoples of the world, should form a coalition to confront and defeat those nations which have banded themselves together with conviction of intellect and devotion of heart to maintain the contrary ideals. It is two fundamental moral principles which are at war with one another in the world today. On the one hand is the principle that the will to power is so much of the essence of a nation that war becomes its primary function and conquest its supreme ideal. On the other hand there is the conviction of those peoples which hold that the essence of the State is to secure justice, and that this justice is to be maintained not simply within the individual nation but in the relations of one State with another throughout the world. The appeal to force is made by them in order to maintain justice, and the maintenance of justice in international relations will inevitably lead to a coalition of the peoples of the world, whose final effect will be the abolition of war.

## ETHICAL GAINS IN THE WAR



## CHAPTER VIII

### ETHICAL GAINS IN THE WAR

The World War marks one of the greatest crises in the moral history of mankind. Future writers on the history of Ethics will be able to see more clearly and completely than we can the moral significance of the developments, national and international, which led up to the war, and of the mighty changes in the structure of society and in the spirit of government throughout the world which it has wrought. But there are certain outstanding facts in the situation whose ethical value we are bound over to consider if we would take our part intelligently and with a clear conscience in the great events of this great hour. In naming them and attempting a brief statement of their significance, we shall be compelled to survey in another form some of the arguments of the preceding chapters.

1. The first great moral advance has been made evident in the world-wide study of the causes of this war. Even the German Government is a witness to the necessity felt in our day for a moral justification of her part in the great event. The

primary desire of the Government quite evidently was to justify the war before the German people themselves, which could be done only by asserting that it is for them a war of defence. It appears that straightforward lies were told in order to deceive the German people. Their Government told them that France had invaded Alsace, that French cavalry were seen in Belgium, that Belgium herself had broken neutrality, all of which assertions are proved to have been without foundation in fact. But they enabled the Kaiser to exercise his constitutional right of declaring war under the plea that it was a war of defence.

A secondary and no less powerful desire gradually awoke in the mind of the German Government, namely, to justify herself before the judgment of the world, and especially of the neutral nations. The idea that what Germany does is right because Germany does it, was a strident utterance of her military Pan-German enthusiasts. It could convince no one outside, and only a section in Germany. It was too immoral and blatant an assertion to prevail over the natural dictates of the human conscience. Hence Germany was compelled to seek one way after another of proving that she was rather the victim and prey of ruthless neighbors than herself a beast of prey.

The act of Belgium, France, and Russia needed no defence. It was justified absolutely by the

unnecessary act of aggression upon their territories on the part of German armies.

The act of Great Britain no doubt may now be described as an act of self-defence. It is clear to the whole world that the conquest of Belgium and France would have proved but a stepping-stone for the conquest of the British Empire. It will ever remain a strange fact that at the beginning of the war the British people were not unanimous, and even the Cabinet was divided as to whether it was the duty of the Government to declare war. So deep had become the passion for peace, so prevalent the belief that Germany might yet be won to a policy of neighborliness and peace in the development of her world relations! It was not until Belgium was actually invaded that the British sprang unanimously to arms. Then honor spoke, and only one voice, a voice of anguish and yet of supreme determination, answered from the heart of the Empire. Even Mr. Lloyd George, a life-long pacifist, who had opposed the Boer War on principle and at the risk of his life, was convinced by this one act of treachery, this one base transgression against the laws of humanity and honor, and became the flaming leader of the Empire in the most tragic and the supreme effort of its history.

As to the actions of America, we have already spoken in a recent page sufficiently. One more quotation from the President's address to Con-

gress is the complete exposition of her spirit: "We are accepting this challenge of hostile purpose because we know that in such a Government, following such methods, we can never have a friend; and that in the presence of its organized power, always lying in wait to accomplish we know not what purpose, there can be no assured security for the democratic governments of the world. We are now about to accept the gage of battle with this natural foe to liberty, and shall if necessary spend the whole force of the nation to check and nullify its pretensions and its power. . . . We have no selfish ends to serve. We desire no conquest, no dominion. We seek no indemnities for ourselves, no material compensation for the sacrifices we shall freely make. We are but one of the champions of the rights of mankind. We shall be satisfied when those rights have been made as secure as the faith and the freedom of nations can make them."

These words will ring for generations to come, as they rang through the world when they were first uttered, as among the most sublime expressions of the devotion of a nation to the noblest moral ideals, and its willingness to stake its all on their accomplishment against a predatory foe.

2. In the second place, we must name as marking one of the great ethical gains of the war that a new conception has been driven home to the heart

of man of what we may call the moralizing of war. This process has been going on for centuries in the development of international law and in the decisions of successive conventions, first of the leading powers at Geneva, 1865, later at the successive Hague Conventions where all the nations of the world were represented. At first sight it may seem as if this war signalized the destruction of this process. Chivalry, which came to life on the fields of France and Flanders and flourished there "when knighthood was in flower," has been done to death, trampled in the very mire of her birth-land by the German spirit. The story of German atrocities not simply against civilians, but even in the act of war, is black indeed. The frequent killing of the wounded, the occasional crucifying of living men, the raiding and shelling of open towns, are all contradictions of that sentiment of humanity which had come to prevail on the field of battle, even in the heat of the fight. The sudden use of deadly gas marked a new era, not only in this war, but in the history of Germany's destruction of chivalry.

The rule of the Allies in meeting these manifestations of diabolism has been perfectly simple. Wherever an act of Germany has been such as to give her armies a military advantage and to threaten defeat of her foes, reprisal in kind has been necessary. Gas has been answered by gas. But where

the act does not yield military advantage, the case has been less clear. As a rule the Allies seem to have decided to avoid reprisal in kind. If the French have occasionally dropped bombs on open towns in Germany, the act has been very rare and goes against the grain of the national character. The rule they have observed is to select only those objects which are of military importance for their attacks; that the neighboring civil population is terrorized is perhaps a welcome by-product of their policy. Where civilians have been killed, the Allies are quite willing to confess it as a regrettable accident. The difference between the German moral character and that of their foes is vividly expressed in the utterance attributed to a British officer. Someone was urging that the British and the French should treat German prisoners exactly as their prisoners were treated in Germany. The story of this treatment is extremely painful and shameful. The British officer replied, "Yes, I suppose we ought to do it. But then, you know, we *can't do it!*"

We must be profoundly thankful that in the face of severe temptation and constant trial of patience, the Allies have striven to maintain the highest standards that have been hitherto attained in the moralizing of warfare. The contrast between the two methods stands before the world, and is giving to humanity everywhere a lesson in prac-

tical ethics which will undoubtedly influence history forever.

3. The ethical progress of humanity is further discovered in the definition of the purposes held by the Allies and America in their prosecution of the war to a victorious issue. In the first place, when they speak unanimously of the defence of democracy, this is no mere form of words or vacuous ideal. Democracy for the self-governing peoples of the world is a spiritual and solid reality of infinite worth. As a method of government it has its own difficulties. It has certain weaknesses when compared with the directness, rigidity, and superficial efficiency of an autocratic government. And of these the democracies of the world are more keenly aware than their critics in imperial palaces. The history of every democracy in the world reflects a systematic effort to correct defects in its government. For the defects are not inherent in the theory. They arise from the imperfections of human nature as it pursues far-off ideals. To overcome them step by step, through self-criticism, humiliation, discussion, even internal disturbance, is itself a noble and lofty ethical task, the highest yet presented to the living conscience of a nation.

On the other hand, the defects of autocracy are inherent in the theory, and utterly incurable by any process of history. The very right of some one family and its chosen advisers to rule a whole

nation autocratically and without responsibility has become in the presence of constitutional monarchies and democracies an actually immoral conception. The evil of it becomes visible in two irresistible tendencies which not merely haunt the heart but drive the will of every autocracy. The first is that of subordinating other interests to the ambition of the rulers. It is practically impossible for the autocrat to interpret the highest good of his people apart from his own personal glory. The other tendency flows from this, and was noted by President Wilson in his address. It consists in the formation of secret purposes concerning the relations of the autocrat and his people to other nations and their interests. These secret purposes become policies, they guide the making of treaties and the forming of alliances, they infect with their poison every form of relationship between that State and all others. The old but potent spirit is passed on from one generation to another. Continuity of will is maintained, working in this sinister and menacing manner upon the life of other peoples.

The present Kaiser is himself the loudest proclaimer of these very facts. He has boasted in speech after speech that he maintains the continuity of the history handed down to him by his predecessors in the Kingdom of Prussia. For him this continuity in the autocratic will is a supreme virtue instead of a crime against the world. With him

the policies which this will shapes in secret and the far-reaching preparations it makes for victory are of the very essence of righteousness instead of the quintessence of wickedness. It was one of the greatest of German students of political science, whom we have repeatedly quoted, who said that the perfecting of a national life must proceed, "provided of course that the principles of moral and political development shall not be opposed to the destiny of humanity."<sup>1</sup> Happy had it been for Germany if this qualification of statecraft had been observed by her rulers. But our whole point is that autocracy is simply incapable of permanently cherishing and obeying this healthful law of national life.

The world cannot endure this system any longer. It has been a menace and a source of irritation among the free. It has made itself at last an intolerable disease in the body of humanity. Excision is the only remedy. That means, of course, that the defeat of Germany is now a moral obligation resting upon the free peoples of the world. It is true that the remedy cannot be made sure without a change in the German mind. This has been well put by Mr. A. F. Whyte, M. P.: "The goal itself, the destruction of German militarism, can only be reached *by the Germans themselves!* Any attempt to achieve it by force from

---

<sup>1</sup> Bluntschli, "The Theory of the State," p. 321.

without can only end in riveting the system more firmly on the acquiescent backs of the German people. No great nation, even in dire defeat, will tolerate any alien attempt to set its house in order. The substitution of free government for the tyranny of militarism must be the deliberate and conscious act of a politically-awakened people: otherwise it cannot last." This is true, but it must be reckoned among the ethical gains in the war both that autocracy must be destroyed and that the German people themselves must learn to do it, with relief and joy to themselves, and the satisfaction of the conscience of mankind.

Democracy has suffered because its deepest principle has only slowly emerged to the view of the world. Men have thought of its freedom from the tyranny and irresponsibility of autocratic rulers, whether one or many. Or they have thought of the noble responsibility which rests on each citizen to vote for the rulers and directors of the State. But that is not the point at which Christ began the history of democracy. There is one passage in Scripture where the two great completely hostile principles of government confront each other. It is that scene where two brothers, thinking of the new community in terms of a vulgar political party with its earthly and selfish prizes, beg for the positions of prominence "in Thy kingdom." Jesus succinctly describes the essence of rulership

among the Gentiles. It means the exercise of authority, personal dominance of others, from which all false ambitions, rivalries, wars, arise. "Not so shall it be among you." The complete antithesis of this spirit is to fill the new community. The path of self-forgetting service is the way to glory. The humblest shall be exalted. Love that gives itself to secure the highest good of others leads to unsought thrones. "Even as the Son of man came," so shall His servants go into the wide world of wild self-seeking. "I am among you as he that serveth," are the words of Him who is their actual ruler there, even as He speaks and they obey. This is the taproot of democracy—the Cross of Him who served even so far as "to give his life a ransom for many." These are the acts, facts, and words which have brought us thus far even to the platform, with all its deficiencies, of the Labor program.

How deeply the idea of service has penetrated the mind of the world is proved by many changes in our conception of the State. "Civil servants" is a term not of reproach but of honor. "Prime Minister" technically means a servant of the Crown, but actually it has become the title of the man who wields the greatest power in the greatest empire in the world, and that on sufferance of the people, for a time measured by their will, not by his, and for ends which must lie outside his personal

enrichment or the aggrandizement of his person and family. The President of the United States is elected to a position of extraordinary power. He is the chief magistrate for four years, and then lays down the exacting burdens of his term of service and steps down to the level of an ordinary citizen with the right to one vote.

This is Christianity at work. And democracy realizes its true essence when it aims at perfecting the spirit in which its citizens learn, not to be served, but each in his place to serve the commonweal. If the war is to make the world safe for democracy, it must become a world where the prizes of life are awarded with increasing public insight and moral conviction, not to those who seek most what "the rulers of the Gentiles" seek, but to those who have spent themselves most wisely and loyally upon the best service of their fellowmen. But democracy cannot quickly succeed, as long as public servants are supposed to rule a mass of business people, among whom selfishness is taken as the law of life and self-aggrandizement the proof of success. The ideal of service must penetrate the whole body politic, and the governors who are elected to serve must be chosen by men who honestly seek in their individual callings not to be served, but to serve.

4. Another proof that the ideals of Christian Ethics are taking hold even of the conduct of the

war is to be found in the special efforts which are being made to raise as high as possible the standards of character among the soldiers of the Allies and of America. We may confine the subject to the armies of America, where four chief methods are being employed. In the first place prohibition is practically enforced on the army and on the civilians in their relation to the army, as a war measure. Any citizen who offers alcoholic drink to a man in uniform is liable to arrest and punishment. What this has done to strengthen the army and to save the nation from scenes of depravity cannot easily be computed. Provision is being increasingly made for the religious life of the men through the chaplains, the Y M C A, and the various other church agencies. The response of the men to the religious appeal rightly made by the right means and men is often most remarkable. Ample provision is also made, chiefly through the Young Men's Christian Association, the Knights of Columbus, and the Young Men's Hebrew Association, for the instruction of the men in the origin and purpose of the war and the spirit in which it must be worthily waged. Thus may be carried throughout the fighting forces the high-souled and moving words of the President: "Just because we fight without rancor and without selfish object, seeking nothing for ourselves but what we shall wish to share with all free peoples, we shall, I feel confident, conduct

our operations as belligerents without passion and ourselves observe with proud punctilio the principles of right and of fair play we profess to be fighting for."

Finally there are carried into the camps and even to the fighting line, chiefly by means of the Y M C A and its parallel institutions named above, opportunities for recreation, rest, and education, some slight substitutes for and suggestion of the comforts and inspiration of club and home life in the home land.

All these splendid efforts to moralize and spiritualize the meaning, method, and purposes of the World War are the undoubted fruit of that spirit which the whole world knows and names as Christian.

5. In the next place the insistent demand is being made by the heart, the mind, and the conscience of mankind that this World War shall end in the complete reconstruction of international relations. Not merely because of the agonies and losses wrought by the war, but because of the revelation which it has given to us all of the causes from which war springs and their ethical disgrace, the human mind has set itself to the mightiest task known to history. This is nothing less than laying the secure foundations of a united humanity. Bluntschli, in the work so often cited, describes the "tendencies towards a common organization of

humanity.”<sup>2</sup> He said, it is true, that “the Aryan race feels itself called to manage the world,” but that was more than forty years ago. Today he would not express it exactly so. Then follows this passage, which because of its authorship by a German who was yet undeflected from correct thinking by the influence of the newly-born Empire, is the more significant: “We have not yet got so far: at the present day it is not so much will and power that are wanting as spiritual maturity. The members of the European family of nations know their superiority over other nations well enough, but they have not yet come to a clear understanding among themselves and about themselves. A definite result is not possible until the enlightening word of knowledge has been uttered about this and about the nature of humanity, and until the nations are ready to hear it. Till then, the universal empire will be an idea after which many strive, which none can fulfil. But as an idea of the future the general theory of the State cannot overlook it. Only in the universal empire will the true human State be revealed, and in it international law will attain a higher form and an assured existence. To the universal empire the particular States are related, as the nations to humanity. Particular States are members of the universal empire and attain in it their completion and their full satisfaction. The

---

<sup>2</sup> “The Theory of the State,” p. 31.

purpose of the universal State is not to break up particular states and oppress nations, but better to secure the peace of the former and the freedom of the latter.”<sup>3</sup>

It was in the same general period of unfettered German life that Dorner, the great theologian, in his famous work, “Christian Ethics,” maintained, “that the ends for which the State exists cannot be reached by means of legal institutions which shall embrace the whole human race, that is, by one universal State, but can only be realized in a multiplicity of States, each possessing its own sovereign power.”<sup>4</sup> But this seems to be a decision due to purely verbal or technical considerations, for on a later page he seems to contradict it in substance, though not in form. “Those beginnings of international law which we see,” he says, “make it possible for Christian nations to hope that one day Christian princes and Christian peoples will unite to form a high Areopagus, to which they will commit the task of settling their differences with each other, so that Christian blood will no longer have to be shed by Christian men.”<sup>5</sup> But Treitschke was teaching at Berlin at the same time as Dorner. And Treitschke won.<sup>6</sup>

<sup>3</sup> “The Theory of the State,” pp. 31, 32.

<sup>4</sup> Dorner, “Christian Ethics.” Trans., p. 556.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 579, 580.

<sup>6</sup> From Treitschke’s victory arose the Kaiser’s speeches, von Bernhardt’s book, *et id genus omne*—and Belgium.

Nevertheless some progress was made even before the war in the direction of the World-State. Of this the years prolific of peace propaganda were witness. The Hague Conventions and Mr. Carnegie's Peace Palace, the very alignment of Europe in opposing leagues of great nations, and the formation of many associations to promote international understanding and concert of mind, were all forces acting in that general direction.

But the World War is the mightiest force. Already, in the intimate cooperation of the enemies of Germany, in their mutual good will, in their willingness to sacrifice for each other as no nation ever did before for another nation, in the mingling of the blood of their sons on the fields of France and Flanders, in the concentration of an international will upon the victory of nations that are equal brothers, free from each other's domination, but in holy bonds to each other's succour, we see far more than mere prophecies or faint beginnings of the universal State. The history of it has definitely begun. The leading nations of the world are co-operating to establish it. The overthrow of German militarism will not only sweep away the supreme obstacle, but will compel the more rapid fulfilment of the age-long dream of seers and saints. The League of Nations has already arisen, a new era in the moral development of humanity.

6. Another sphere in which the war has hastened

ethical progress must be referred to less at length than its importance demands. The war has compelled the democratic powers to reconstruct their industrial life. Indeed, it is the entire fabric of society that is being rapidly changed. Two of the most dignified, luminous, and far-reaching documents produced in the war are "Labor and the New Social Order," adopted by the British Labour Party, and "Labor War Aims," the agreement adopted by the Inter-Allied Labor and Social Conference in London, February, 1918.<sup>7</sup>

In these momentous utterances we discover the force and breadth of the changes which have come like a tidal wave upon the slowly unfolding internal history of the allied nations. The former document does not profess any abstract socialist program, nor do its proposals involve the doctrine of communism. Its fundamental principles are three-fold: first, every worker by hand or brain must receive the full value of his labor, and the determination of this must not be left to the decision of any class of employers; second, the Government must take full control and retain the initiative as to education, adjustment of wages to changing economic conditions, etc.; third, the immediate nationalization of land, railways, mines, and the production of electrical power, must be arranged.

---

<sup>7</sup> Both documents are published, the former in draft form, by *The New Republic*, New York.

The fulcrum on which the powerful lever of the Labor Party rests is the fact that all these features of the program are already in operation more or less completely, by stress of the war.

Two quotations will suffice to give us a sense of the ethical idealism and the intense earnestness which inform this powerful declaration of principle: "If we repudiate, on the one hand, the imperialism that seeks to dominate other races, or to impose our own will on other parts of the British Empire, so we disclaim equally any conception of a selfish and insular 'non-interventionism,' unregarding of our special obligations to our fellow-citizens overseas; of the corporate duties of one nation to another; of the moral claims upon us of the non-adult races, and of our own indebtedness to the world of which we are part." And again, "Especially in all the complexities of politics, in the still undeveloped science of society, the Labor party stands for increased study, for the scientific investigation of each succeeding problem, for the deliberate organization of research, and for a much more rapid dissemination among the whole people of all the science that exists. And it is perhaps specially the Labor party that has the duty of placing this advancement of science in the forefront of its political program. . . . But no Labor party can hope to maintain its position unless its proposals are, in fact, the outcome of the best political science of its time; or to fulfil its

purpose unless that science is continually wresting new fields from human ignorance. Hence, although the purpose of the Labor party must, by the law of its being, remain for all time unchanged, its policy and its program will, we hope, undergo a perpetual development, as knowledge grows, and as new phases of the social problem present themselves, in a continually finer adjustment of our measures to our ends. If law is the mother of freedom, science, to the Labor party, must be the parent of law."

Assuredly the fruits of the great war will not be measured merely in terms of tears and blood. There is a spirit in man, there is a moral energy at work even amid sin, suffering, and death, ghastly as these may be, which is securing many a victory for the Sermon on the Mount.

7. Amongst important moral values which result from the war we must reckon those which are being discovered and realized among the voluntary services rendered in a multitude of ways by the general populations, especially of Great Britain and America. These countries had become habituated to the ways of peace, their attention had been fastened upon the problems of commerce and the development of the national life in the lines of material prosperity, luxury, and aesthetic interests. There can be no doubt that a great deal too much attention was given exclusively to sport

and pleasure of all kinds. These interests have, of course, their value. The value is vital and immeasurable if they are subordinate to the tension of a life spent upon high aims and hard endeavors. They become diseases just at the point where they become the ends of life, the chief interests of the heart and mind of large sections of the population. Suddenly the war broke upon us, and a moral transformation as extensive as it has been sudden took possession of the inhabitants of these lands.

In the first place, we must take account of the devotion of the manhood of these peoples to the active task of war. Volunteers must be counted not by hundreds of thousands, but by millions, men who gave up all that they might get to the fighting lines. In the vast majority of cases probably the impulse was not that of mere youthful adventure. There was something of moral idealism, something of passionate patriotism, something of profound conviction, which underlay and gave direction and force to the decision and spirit of the volunteers. When conscription came it found men, who for innumerable reasons had not volunteered, ready to answer the call of their country, and many of the noblest soldiers and the best fighters have been found among the ranks of drafted men.

In the second place, the population as a whole found its energies drawn upon to carry on many

forms of service without which the armies could not be supported at the front. In America already thousands of men and women have given up positions of importance and lives of ease to serve long hours in unaccustomed places under restricted conditions, in order to assist the organizations on which are based the training and movement and fighting success of the armies. The world knows how lavish has been this sacrificial spirit in Great Britain and France.

In the third place, there fell upon the hearts of these countries the demand for service and for money required in many ways not strictly military, but that bore upon the succor of the wounded, the comfort of prisoners, the support of families left destitute in devastated lands, the conduct of the instrumentalities of education and religion in the camps and even in the trenches, the aid required by many wives and children whose supporters had been taken to war. In these and other ways, especially as far as America is concerned, through the wonderful organization of the Red Cross, the moral enthusiasm of the people has been roused, and multitudes have given large sums whose charities hitherto were mere dribblets. Large numbers who toiled only for their own pleasure are now toiling long hours every day for the blessing of others.

Among the most remarkable evidences of devotion, readiness for sacrifice, intelligent cooperation,

we must name the response made by the citizens of America to the demands of the Department of Food Administration. "Hooverizing" is one of those humorous terms by which men have delighted to express a very serious situation. Few more impressive testimonies to the soundness of a national heart could be found than the response made by the American people to the call of Mr. Hoover that they should deny themselves in matters of food and drink for the support of the Allies and the winning of the war. Germany cannot understand how a people could ration themselves. Any nation accustomed to wait only for the directions of its rulers under penalty of law has no conception of how a people can take the mere proclamation of a need as a command that must be obeyed. Mr. Hoover has announced that hundreds of millions of bushels of this, hundreds of thousands of pounds of that, hundreds of thousands of measures of something else have been saved during the winter of 1917-18 by the American people. They have taken these things from their tables that they might find their way to the tables of Great Britain and France. It was done voluntarily, gladly, not as a sacrifice, but as a joyous duty. It cannot be said, alas, that all have acted in this way; too large are the classes of people whose minds are too idle and hearts too selfish for such an act. But the fact stands that Mr. Hoover is himself

amazed at the nation-wide extent of this generous response to his guidance and his inspiration.

Among the most cheering and hopeful features of the situation is the witness borne by the churches that enthusiasm for Christian work at home and abroad has not abated but has been rather intensified during the war. It seems strange that when nations are giving so much in taxation and benevolent gifts for war causes directly, they should have increased their contributions to the work of foreign missions. It seems as if the imagination had been widened, the spiritual insight of men had been deepened, the sense of responsibility had become more grave and more compelling. They who have been doing most and making the gravest sacrifices for the war itself are those who have enlarged their wonted support of the great cause of the Gospel.

In the last place, we must note a deeper sense of religious need. It is true that in some of the lands that have been longer at war people speak of a lessening interest in religion. This can only be on the surface. What we find everywhere is that men and women are open to religious thought and religious appeal whose lives lay beyond this vision in past days. The spectacle of a world wrecking itself, of multitudes of lives carried off simultaneously into the unseen, of brutality and sorrow, sacrifice and sin, the experience of bereavement, of homes broken forever, of hearts made lonely

for the rest of their lives—these things are of spiritual import, they have drawn people together in deeper sympathy who had no ties and no contacts before. They have spread through the community a certain seriousness and tenderness which make the determination of their wills the more strong and the picture of a Christian nation at war more sublime.

He would be mad who says that it is worth being at war to win these results; but he would be equally untrue to the facts who ignores these blessings of the spirit which God in His mercy is drawing out of human hearts, even in the midst of the tragedy which seems to wreck their lives.

8. On a survey of the course of argument which we have pursued, it appears that we ought to conclude by a joyous celebration of the Victory of the Sermon on the Mount! This startling result is not so much of a paradox as it seems. True, we began by considering the case of those who set the World War and the teaching of Jesus Christ in complete hostility, as wholes which mutually exclude one another. It seemed as if the only right thing to say must be this: Whatever war is, it excludes the Spirit of Christ, and, Whatever the Spirit of Christ is, it cannot be found in warfare. To many minds that is self-evident.

But in the course of our argument several things have become clear which not only make us less

certain of that position, but force us to see the nature and history of war and the mind of Christ in deeper historical and essential relations with one another. For example, it has assuredly become clear that war can be, on the part of a people like the Belgians defending their existence, a pure effort (as pure as human effort could ever be) to maintain moral order, to repress wrongdoing, and to do it by the exercise of force. Now that effort is a divine thing. God Himself makes it. Jesus Christ made it, even if only symbolically, in cleansing the Temple. Further, we have seen reason to believe that morality needs always a physical basis for its manifestation, just as life needs it if life is to be something real for us in our world of experiences. On the other hand, the Spirit of Jesus, which was exhibited in act as well as speech, and whose action is as far above our reach apparently as the Sermon on the Mount, has no way of being manifested by us at all except it be in our physical and social life. It is not by taking us out of the world, but by keeping us from the evil that His Spirit has its way with us. What we say and do where we are, as we are, in the midst of our conscious weakness and blindness, that is our life; and exactly there, and only there, is the Spirit of Christ to be found in us, and to have its way with us. The Sermon on the Mount from first to last is addressed to men and women who must hear it, grasp it, obey it, in the midst of this

world and all its claims and forces of nature. As married, as in business, as under government, as exercising government, as workman at a carpenter's bench or banker putting his money out at interest, as teacher, traveler, scholar, soldier, the words of Jesus enter a man's heart and find him where he is.

Now that means that the Sermon on the Mount is not a mere ideal hung in the sky to allure, baffle, condemn the human soul. Many elude its difficult problems by that notion of it, and so lose all its thrilling, compulsory energy. They can have no vision of the measureless sway which it has exercised and exercises today over the conscience and the conduct of man.

Therefore I venture the assertion that nowhere has the Sermon on the Mount, the embodiment in words of the Spirit of Christ, exercised more visible and amazing power than in the matter of war. If today the world is horrified, aghast, at what the will to war can do, it is because all its meaning, methods, and results are subjected to the standard of His Spirit. That will must be broken and cast as a disgraceful thing into the past. But it is being broken by the might of the command, Love your enemies. Yet the strange thing is that the triumph of that command at this point cannot be and is not being secured by pacifists. It is being secured by the gradual discovery, an age-long process, that war is absolutely wrong on

the side of the self-seeking and criminal aggressor, and absolutely right on the part of the defender.

As the individual is protected from crime not by willingness on his part to submit to assault and robbery, but by yielding the original right of self-defence to the State, so the nations of the world are learning in and through the World War that security against aggression is to be won not by a duel between the two, but by yielding the act of justice up to the league of nations. So were the warring dukedoms of medieval France brought into the harmonious life of a nation. So were the kingdoms, dukedoms, principalities, and free cities of Germany welded into the unity of the German Empire. These all had been rival States. When they yielded their international rights to a higher power, they ceased to war with one another and learned even amid continued rivalries and jealousies to sacrifice themselves for the whole. And that is love among enemies! The warring nations and empires of the whole world surely must have learned through the fearful penalties of a world war to yield up part of their freedom of international action. When they have slowly and painfully mastered the bewildering problems which are involved, they will establish that universal State of which ancient prophets and modern poets have dreamed, which statesmen and militarists, philosophers and preachers of the Gospel have combined

in their several ways to produce. Not till then can we have the fulfilment of the divine promise that there shall be "peace on the earth among men of good will."

That is why this war, when carried by the Allies and America to the right issue, will be another proof of the divine power of the Sermon on the Mount.



# INDEX

---

- Abstract ideas, 3f., 54, 69.  
 Armenians, 48.  
 Autocracy, 167f.
- Bang, Dr. J. P., 61f., 68.  
 Barclay, 83, 90.  
 Belgium, 45, 94, 124, 132, 139,  
 149, 150, 157, 162.  
 Bernhardi, von, 65-68, 70, 120,  
 126.  
 Beyens, Baron de, 149.  
 Bluntschli, 24, 54f., 63, 169, 174f.  
 Bosanquet, 24f.  
 British Empire, 34.
- Chéradame, André, 125.  
 Christ (Jesus) and the Church,  
 13, 75ff. Cross and Resurrec-  
 tion, 94-96. Moral order,  
 185ff. Roman Government,  
 83f., 88. Sermon on Mount,  
 86ff. The State, 76f., 81ff.
- Church, The, 12f.; founding of,  
 76; moral influence of, 100-  
 103, 112ff.; and sacrifice, 49f.;  
 and the State, 76ff.; (Christ),  
 79, 99 (Paul); and war, 81,  
 147.  
 "Conquest and Kultur," 127, 138.  
 Creighton, Mrs., 94.
- Darwinism and War, 68.  
 Democracy, 167, 170-172.  
 Dorner, 20, 21, 133, 176.
- France, 162.  
 Friends, Society of (Quakers),  
 7ff., 27.  
 Frymann, D., 137.
- Geibel, E. von, 62.  
 George, Lloyd, 163.  
 Gerard, J. W., 154.  
 German character, 59ff., 66f.,  
 166; mind, 53f., 129.
- German Empire, 33, 46.  
 German Government, defects  
 of, 58ff.; efficiency of, 56; and  
 Hague Convention, 127f.; in-  
 ternational law, 133f.; men-  
 ace to the world, 140f., 157;  
 military force, as, 57, 66f.,  
 177; policy of devastation,  
 135ff.; of ruthless war, 131-  
 135; possible change in, 169f.;  
 and treaties, 139; self-justifi-  
 cation of, 161f.
- Germany, population of, 63f.;  
 prayer for, 109f.; responsibil-  
 ity of, for the war, 119ff.,  
 141f.
- Great Britain, declaration of  
 war by, 149-151, 163; unpre-  
 paredness of, 148.
- Grey, Sir Edward, 149.
- Harden, M., 123.  
 Hate and Fear, 107f.  
 Hegel, 20, 54f.  
 Herrmann, W., 39.  
 Hocking, W. E., 106, 110, 115.  
 Hodgkin, T., 93f.  
 Hoover, Herbert, 183.  
 Horton, R. F., 90f.
- Individual, responsibilities of  
 the, 27.
- Kaiser (Emperor), The, 57, 63,  
 65, 120ff., 130, 162, 168f., 176.
- Labor party, program of, 179ff.  
 Lange, Fr., 137.  
 Liberty, Stephen, 81n.  
 Lichnowsky, Prince, 149.  
 Love, of enemies, 89ff.; omnip-  
 otence of, 104ff.; and prayer,  
 108ff.
- Luxemburg, 47, 48, 96.

- Mackenzie, John, illustration  
from life of, 114-117.  
Maurice, F. D., 44.  
Mexico, 154.  
Murray, Sir G., 4.
- Nippold, G., 126.
- Pacifism, Theory of, 7-12.  
Patriotism, 30.  
Paul, the Apostle, his doctrine  
of the State, 96ff.; Roman  
citizen, 98.  
Potsdam, Council at, 123.  
Prussia, 66, 120.
- Quakers (see Society of Friends).
- Reconstruction, social and in-  
dustrial, 177ff.  
Regulus, sacrifice of, 95f.  
Religion and the State, 20, 29,  
48.  
Russia, 139, 149, 162.
- Sermon on the Mount, The,  
86ff.; literal application of,  
92f.; meaning of, 91ff.; in-  
fluence of, 103; victory of,  
180, 185ff.
- State, The, definition of, 17-20;  
and defensive war, 41ff., 47ff.;  
divine institution, 20f.; and  
force, 23ff.; forms of, 33f.;  
and individual, 26ff.; inter-  
national morality, 18, 30ff.,  
35, 40f.; object of, 22f., 56f.;  
as "power," 55, 65ff.; and  
sacrifice, 48ff., 94ff.; as "will,"  
54; universal? 174ff., 188f.
- Treitschke, 176.  
Troeltsch, E., 71f.  
Turkey, 48.
- United States, The, and the  
War, 145f., 155-158, 167.
- Votaw, C. W., 86.
- Wagner, K., 138.  
War, correct statement of prob-  
lem, 1-5; as function of the  
State, 12, 47f., 67ff.; (Ger-  
man view), 128; as moral  
obligation, 157f.; moralizing  
of, 164ff.; results of German  
theory of, 129ff.  
Whyte, A. F., 169.  
Wilson, President Woodrow,  
142, 151-156, 163f., 168, 173.

School of Theology  
at Claremont

A 10401





D  
524  
M316

**Mackenzie, William Douglas, 1859-1936.**  
Christian ethics in the world war, by W. Douglas Mackenzie ... New York, Association press, 1918.  
xi, 192 p. 194<sup>cm</sup>.

1. European war, 1914-1918—Religious aspects. 1. Title.

Library of Congress

D524.M316

CCSC/jc

A10401

